

2
Unvvarranted Principles
leading to unwarranted
PRACTISES,
Sought out and
EXAMINED.

OR
A brief Tryal of the Principles, and prin-
cipal grounds improved against the seventh
dayes Sabbath, wherein the mistakes of the
alleged Texts are clearly discovered,
and some grounds for its present ob-
servations; with a few queries
proposed.

By Christopher Pooley a servant of Jesus Christ.

*We have a more sure word of Propb fie, whereunto we do well that we take
hend, 2.Pt.1.19.*

*Cease my son to bear the instruction that causeth to err from the words of
knowledge, Prov.19.27.*

*All thy Commandments are Truth, yea and sure, and they stand fast for
ever and ever, and are done in truth and rig'tousnesse, Ps.119.128.111.73.*

*I have esteemed all thy Precepts concerning all things to be rigt, and I
hate every false way, Ps. 119. 128.*

London, Printed for the Authour, 1669

B. Belloe Linnemann

Engestrom Cenibus

DETTO DA G. A. GÖTTI

1800. 10. 03.

5

Detto da G. A. G. Götti
1800. 10. 03.
Joh. Engestrom Cenibus

Detto da G. A. G. Götti

Detto da G. A. G. Götti

l. 200

To all that fear the Lord in truth, greeting,
with unsinead love in Jesus Christ.

ALthough I can truly judge my self the unworthiest of all the servants of Christ to present any thing to your consideration, yet the pretiousness and as I judge weightines of the thing in hand, the indeareed affection I bear to you, and the importunity of several friends, with the willingness I have to bear my Testimony to this that have been of such pretious use to my soul hath engaged me beyond my former thoughts to appear in Print. Tis my first fruits, and therefore I present them to the Lord and you as his holy Priest-hood, 1 Pet. 1. 9. the subject is honourable it were well if you could call it so Isa. 58. 13. some can, thanks to the Lord, & honour him: the truth is as antient as man almost; but a day between them, Gen. 2. 2. how ever it may seem a strange thing, yet tis one of the great things of Gods Law written to you, Hosea 8. 12. its worth your enquiring after, for tis one turn up to the Kingdom. Isay. 58. 13. 14. if you do this and the rest you shall not miss the Lords hand to take you up to his holy Mounta n, Isay. 56. 7. The fire is kindled in our Ierusalem, may not this be one C. e, or cause, read and consider, I. r. 17. 21. 22. 27. have we not been in Babylon, yea, ecce signum: behold the token, Nebemah 13. 15. 16. 17. 18. Are we got out of Egypt, and will the Lord make known to us his Holy Sabbath, or the Lords sake my dear Bretheren be willing to understand it, and refuse it not for tis holy, just, and good, as the rest of the Law, and as needfull to know as ever it was; yea and spiritual. verse 14. And if any of you be so carnal as to break it, Rom. 8. 7. Although you do not break all of the commandements, yet if you break one of them you are guilty of all, Jam. 2. Oh let not us commit this Sacriledg robbing God of his Holy day, lest the Name of Jesus amongst the Jews be blasphemed, your uncircumcision shall then be counted circumcision, if you keep the righteousness of the Law, and althoough you be th. uncircumcision by nature, yet if you fulfil the Law you shall be their judges who by the lester and circumcision do transgress the Law and truly without thi you will hardl be accounted by the Lord, a. f. minwardly or the true circumcision who shal have his praise not of men but of God. say not we cannot fulfil the Law, for therfore did God send his Son, because that the righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh but after the spirit, Rom. 8. 3. 4. say not Christ taught you to break it, for the whole Law was in his heart, Isay. 46. 8. And if thou beest righteous & hast an heart like Christs will it not be in thine Ps. 37. 31. Say not you are under a new Law left in the day of Christ your proof be to se k. say not the Sabbath is changed, nor yet made void, lest th. living not to be found you be found in sin unrepented of; will you say y. u. know not the daye that will no more

Nchem.
9. 14.

Rom. 7.

12.

Rom. 2.
Rom. the
4. to the
end.

excuse you then Abimelechs ignorance of Abrahams wife did him, Gen. 20 tis
ould you, and you will be left unexcusable John. the 7th day is the Sabbath
of the Lord for the mouth o' the Lord hath spoken it, call it not the Jews Sab-
bath, for Scripture doth not call it so; if they were commanded to keep it, so they
were commanded to have no other Gods but him; out the law as well as the
promise spoken to the same Israel, Acts. 7.2. Deut. 5.17. Say not thou art
not bound to hear Moses, lest Christ send thee to him with you have Moses & the
Prophets bear them, diminish not, nor add where God hath not, tell the curse over
take you, Deut. 4.2. Prov. 30.5. Rev. 27.18. take heed you add no new Sabbath,
nor take away the old, take not part with the man of sin who thought to change
times and laws, bind not up thy lamb to that only which was spaken after the re-
surrection of Christ lest those miss of what that Prophet sayd, nre to the new Testi-
ment lest thou be at a loss for a Scripture warrant and miss of Paul's faith,
Acts. 24.14. Cor. 9.8 g.1. Heb. 12.5. comp. with Pro. 3.11. My dear friends,
it hath been always the delight of Satan to destroy the Authority of Scripture
bonds either totally as in the Akitis, qnd at this day the Quakers, so hearken to
an Idol either without or within them, or in part as all these do that deny the
Tim. 3. writings by Moses, and the Prophets, nay and the four Evangelists as too many
at this day to avoid the Sabbath, but try such persuasions for sh y come not of
him that called you, Gal. 1. Think not o' such a dispensation as the Scripture
mentions not, lest God deny it at last; it may be thou mayst think it much to be
taught by such an one as I, truly so do I, Indeed I wonder that the Lord should
hide from the wise and prudent, and should reveal it to babes, but tis that no
flesh should glory in his sight, if the Lord wil make use of the foolish, poor,
weak, despised base things. 1 Cor.1. And work by them, who can let it; I
must confess with I-r-mah I am a child, and with Moses, I am not eloquent,
it may be you will judge me a fool, truly I have learned to become a fool that
I might be wise, and so do you; well whatever I am, I am persuaded this is the
truth as tis in Jesus that I here present you with, and the rather in such a
time as this, when the Church is going into the Wild-ernes, the second time the
Lord teach her his law, there as he did Israel of old and David, Psal. 115.112.

You will thin be a blessed people indeed, Psal. 94.12. Now the judgments
of God are abroad in the land, learn righteousness, fear and depart from evl
reduces ols rage and are confident, Prov. 14.16. Let not rebukes, crosses nor
lesser dotes you, Godliness is profitable in all things, and for the promises of the
things of this life and tht which is to come, will I shall leave you to the Lord in
the serious perusal of these things, if you should not own them, we cease not to
own and pray for me in that I desire to remain your friend

Christopher Pooler

From my study in Norwich.



Unwarranted Principles leading to unwarranted practices sought out and examined.

The first practice.

THe first day of the week unwarrantably observed as Pract. 1. a Sabbath by some, as a Lords day, by others.
Principle.

The principle that they move upon is, that the Prince Sabbath day was changed by Jesus Christ, which wanting cleare Scripture proof, they flee to consequences raised from unwarranted propositions, or rather suppositions, As first, Prop. 1.

That the great reason of the 7th dayes Sabbaths observation is the commemoration of the great work of Creation; wch the Scripture doth no where say, but Gods finishing his work the six dayes, rested the 7th, and because he rested the 7th, and was refreshed, therefore he blessed the 7th day and sanctified it, and so made it for man, *Mark 2.* which was to be a follower of God, see *Ephe. 5.1.1. John. 2.6.* Prop. 2.

That the work of Redemption is a greater work, then the work of Creation, and therefore must carry the honour of the Sabbath weekly observation away with it, both from the Father and his work, for if from his work, then from him. But first.

1. The Scripture doth no where say that the work of redemption was greater then the work of Creation; for although the one shews the greatness of his love, the other shews the greatness of his power, *Psal. 19.1.* Besides that which hath his dependance, is less Honourable then that upon which it hath its dependance, as all that hath its dependance of God is less then God. 2. But the work of Redemption

2. Redemption depends on the Creation, neither doth the Scripture say that the greater work was to carry the honor of the Sabbaths weekly observation, its but a supposition, and ex *suppositio nihil ponatur in re*, i.e. From a supposition can be gathered no sound conclusion, and as they have no Scripture for either, so they want reason too; for first it cannot be reasonably imagined, nay I think tis against Scripture and reason too to suppose, that God the Father should give or cause to be given more honour to the Son, then to himself, nay tis enough that we honour the Son, as we honour the Father, *John. 5.23.* And the Sons work as we honour the Father, *viz.* By giving him and his work another dayes observation, if it had been required; but to take away the honour of the Sabbaths weekly observation from the Fathers work of Creation as the less, and to put it upon the Sons work as the greater, is to honour the Son and his work, more then the Father and his work.

*John 10.
29.*

But secondly, to me there seems not to be the like reason, for a weekly observation of a day for the work of redemption because it was not finished in a week, which was the reason of Gods setting apart the Seventh day at the Creation, if indeed Christ had finished his work of redemption in six days, & had rested a seventh, and blessed it and sanctified it, then by equal reason it ought to have been observed with the Seventh day, but otherwise at most it can require by no scripture warrant more then a yearly day, as must better be pleaded for, from *Exod. 12.14.* *Clap. 13.3. 10.* *Compare. 1.*

I. Cor. 14.7.8.

Prop. 3. That the work of redemption was finished, and Christ rested upon the first day of the week, therefore we are bound to keep the first day of the week.

But first, Tis no where in Scripture sayd, that either the work of redemption was finished upon the first day of the week, or that Christ rested upon it.

But secondly, Tis manifest by comparing *John 19.28.30.* *31. Ephe 1.7. Heb. 10.11.* That the work of our redemption was finished on the sixth day, that so Christ rested on the Seventh day from all his work as God did from his; according to these, *Scriptures. Heb. 4.10. 10. Acts 2.26. Rev. 14.13.*

Eccle.

Eccle. 9.10. His body being at rest in the grave all day long, and his soul in paradise, which he did not on the first day of the week, for he traviled, went down to *Emaus* and back to *Jerusalem* (if he appeared to the Eleven that day, as some say) which was twice 60. Furlongs that's fifteen miles, as did also the two Disciples to whom he appeared without the least rebuke for so spending the day in their ordinary travels, *Luke. 24.*

But tis objected that the work of our redemption was not finished on the sixt day, because the Apostle sayeth if Christ be not risen, our faith is vain, and we are yet in our sins, *1. Cor. 15.17.* And that the resurrection was the great part of the work of our redemption. Obj.

Answ. To the which I answer by proposing two queries to your consideration.

Quest. 1. Whether (if according to you) the resurrection of Jesus Christ was so great a part of the work of our redemption, whether I say that first day of the week being the day upon which he rose and performed that work, it was not one of Christs working dayes. If so,

Qu. 2. Whether we are bound by the Fourth Commandment or any other Scripture to keep Gods or Jesus Christs working day or his resting day.

3. Quest. Nay further, whether you have not by this your objection overthrown your proposition, which sayeth that Christ rested, his work being finished the first day, when as yet you say in your objections the greatest part of his work was yet to finish on the first day, and that he did do that work on it, and so did not rest; and thus have you destroyed your whole foundation. But forthly.

That the Disciples of Jesus Christ kept the first day constantly, there is no one Scripture speaks such a thing, those alledged, but strained beyond their measure are *John. 20.* Prop. 4.

Acts. 20.7. *1. Cor. 11.1.2.* *Rev. 1.10.* *Mark. 1.28:* *Psal. 118 John 20.* 2. Which I shall examine, as for *J. b. n. the 20.* That speaks tryed, nothing of keeping the day, nor yet so much as of any meeting for religious worship, but to sup together, as may appear compared with, *Mark. 16.4.*

Acts the 20.7. Seems to speak the same thing, viz. That the busines of their comming together was to break bread with

with Paul before he departed, being to go away on the morrow; whether it was that breaking bread that was by institution at the Lords Supper is uncertain. 1. Seeing there is other breaking of bread mentioned in Scripture besides that, as *Mark. 6.41. Ch. 8.6. Act. 2.46. Luke. 24.30.35.* 2. Because no mention made of the cup as in all other places where that is spoken of. 3. Because heres nothing of his giving it to his Disciples after he had blessed it and brake it. Nor 4. can it be so proved to say that the Disciples came to break bread in the Lords Supper, seeing they are only to take it when tis broken for them by the Minister of Christ, therefore at best tis but an uncertainty, and from an uncertain conception can be gathered no certain conclusion: beside tis not said when the Disciples came together to keep the day, but when they came together to break bread; now we know that is at night, or else tis not a Supper; but a breakfast or dinner as Papists and too many others practice, and so it seems to be here, for when they came together, Paul preached to them, and there were lights in the Chamber where they were met, which speaks it most; besides otherwise in reason Paul could not have preached till midnight, and then conferred till break of day; yea further they did not break bread till midnight and after, and then it was the second day he brake bread, or else it was the first day in the morning that he travelled on his journey; but I would ask whether the meeting together at night to break bread, and Pauls preaching in the night binds us to keep the day before or the same time, viz. the night, if any, nay further are we not bound by that example to meet as much in an upper Chamber if example binds, because that's mentioned too? besides if the translators had dealt well with you, it had not been called the first day of the week neither here nor *1. Cor. 16.* nor yet in *John. 20.* But one of the Sabbaths or weeks, i. e. One day of the Seventh Sabbath or weeks that were to be counted between the feast of unleavened bread, mentioned vers. 6. And the feast of Pentecost, vers. 16. Compared with *Lev. 23.* from the 4. to the 16. One of which dayes was the day of resurrection, & therefore in many places called *μετα των ουρανων* although because it was also the first day of the week,

Mark. 16. 9. It is called also ~~προτόν τὸν καθέαν~~ to that this occasion of stumbling would have been utterly taken away had they rightly translated it.

As for the *1. Cor. 16.* That speaks neither of keeping of the *1. Cor. 16* day, nor yet of meeting on it, but every man to lay by himselfe tryed. in store ; and this not constantly, for there was to be none when *Paul* came, and surely he came not to destroy Sabbath Dayes duties ; nay it was not gathered together or made up till a year after, see the *2 Cor. 8. and 9 Chapters* ; but again 'twas not nor could not be an universal dutie to relieve the Churches of *Jerusalem*. 1 Not to all Saints, because all were not nor are not able to do it, but many had need of relief themselves ? Nay not all Churches, for some of them were not able, as *Paul* confess of the Churches of *Macedonia*, *2. Cor. 8.* And therefore he hoped for nothing from them, that what they did, it was of their own selves, that is without any command from him; nay further he sayeth expressly that what he had enjoyned the *Corinthians* was not by commandment, i. e. from the Lord, but by occasion, *vers. 8.* Now could it be an universall dutie and not binde all Saints, nor yet all Churches, no nor any , but onely an occasionall thing ?

But, *Rev. 1.10.* makes not so much as mention of the first day of the week, neither is called either the Lords day in all the Scripture, but if any day the Seventh day, which is the Sabbath, see *Isay. 58. 13* *Mark 2. 28.*

*Rev. 1. 10.
tryed*

Some conlude from *Mark* the second, because Christ is called *Mark. 2. 28.* the Lord of the Sabbath, that therefore he might do with it what he would, he might change it. But 1. the question still remains did he change it ? If so, let it be shewed, if not, let it not be affirmed. But

Secondly, I do humbly conceive that a man may be Lord of that he may not change, God hath made the man Lord of his wife, see *Gen. 3. 16* *1. Cor. 14. 34. 1 Pet. 3. 5. 6.* Nay Christ Lord of his Harvett, his chosen People, but they may not change them, may the man change his wife, or do with her what he will ? nay mee thinks rather we may argue from Christe being Lord of the Sabbath, his engagement to keep and care for it and maintain it as he doth his people and the husband his wife, see *Ephe. 5. from 22 to 29.* And so he seems to do when he is carefull that his

Psal. 118. Disciples who were to be put to flight, should not fly neither in
24. tryed, the winter, because that is tedious to their bodies, nor on the
Sabbath day, Mat. 24.20.

Some alledge; Psal. 118. 24. This is the day that the Lord hath
made &c.

But first its not manifest to all that is it spoke of any other then
the Seventh day, if of any particular day, and that for these
reasons.

1. Reas. First because twas the day that Christ was laid the head or
chief Stone of the Corner, verf. 22. Now Christ was laid upon
the Sabbath day, for first the chief Stone of the Corner of an
house is the foundation Stone, and so tis sayd of Christ, see Isay.
28. 16. Behold I lay in Syon for a foundation, a stone a tr-
ed stone, a corner stone, a sure foundation: now that is the
Stone that's called the foundation that is laid lowest, and this
Christ was on the Sabbath day, when he was in the Grave;
beside otherwise it cannot be a proper allusion, for its not pro-
per to say that Christ was laid or built upon us, but we upon
him, and therein indeed David and we do much rejoice that
we have such a foundation, Ephes. 2. 19. 20. 21. 22

2. Reas. Because, David never kept the first day, but the Seventh, but
the text saith we will rejoice and be glad in it, David himself
as well as others, although I rather think tis spoken of the great
day of the Lord. But lastly, doth this bind to a weekly observati-
on of the day, if it should be meant of a first day of the week?
may not a yearly days observation suffice to fullfil that Prophesi?
Seeing there is not such a word as we will rejoice in it weekly,
or rather that it should be a meet act of faith, as twas in David
in believing and rejoicing that Christ was exalted, and so no
day observed at all; indeed these seem to be poor grounds
for the Sabbath change, whereof there is not one word in that
place; and therefore dear friends who ever you are that keep the
first day for a Sabbath or Lords day upon these grounds, I am af-
raid you must do as many are forced at this day, wherein light
shines to clear to the discovering of their supposed scripture
grounds, seeing them to fail, are forced to run to tradition of
their Fathers, and so bring themselves under the sore rebuke of
Jesus Christ, why do you through your traditious make void the
commands of God, whom he calls Hypocrites, drawing nigh to
him with their lips when their hearts are far from him, let such
consider

consider these Scriptures, *Nebem.* 13. 15, 16, 17, 18. *Ezech.* 20. Besides
18, 19, 1 Pet. 1. 18. Their Fathers broke Sabbath, and it was ^{those will} sayle
a vain conversation they got by tradition from their Fathers, them too.
&c.

But further, we have a more sure word of prophetic whereunto we do well that we take heed, more sure then any voice from heaven, 2 Pet 1. 18, 19. and then certainly more sure then any voice from earth, which is able to make the man of God wise to Salvation, through faith that is in Christ, & throughly to furnish him to every good work; and therefore certainly tis not a good work, if the Scripture be not able throughly to furnish us to it,

2 Tim. 3.15, 17.

And so much for the first, the first dayes observation. I shall now come to the second, viz.

The Seventh dayes Sabbaths Abolition.

The second Practise.

The Seventh dayes Sabbath unwarrantably nulled and broken *Pract. 2.*
by unwarranted Principles.

The Principle is, That the morality of the fourth Commandment which is the Sabbath is abiding, but the ceremoniality, which is the Seventh Day, that's abolished by Christ the Substance, but as I said before so I must say again this is without Scripture proof, besides the absurdity that attends it, as I shall endeavour to shew. But first let us examine the pretended proofs, which are Col. 2. 6. Heb. 4. With the reasons produced; as for Col. 2. if that speaks any thing about the Seventh Day Sabbath of the Lord our God, its against the morality, i.e. the Sabbath; and not the ceremonialitie as they call it, i.e. the Seventh day, for it cannot reasonably be supposed that to be intended that is not mentioned, and that nor (which is any thing of it) is expressed, so that tis the Sabbath is abolished, if any thing, by that place for we know that the Seventh day abides, yea and the Sabbath of the Lord too, if the word of the Lord abides for ever.

Col. 2. 16.
Cel. 2. tryed.

But as for Heb 4. I have not kill enough to find the verse that Heb. 4. should do this strange act, only this is surmised by some, because tryed. the Seventh days rest is mentioned in that Chap. with other rests, that therefore it must be a type of one rest or another: But first, this must be still the Sabbath that they say is morall, not the Se-

The rea. Seventh day, but lets see whether there be more reason then
sons tryed Scripture , the first reason alledged is this because tis not
written in the heart of man by nature, which they endeavor

to prove by many arguments, as follows; Every man say they

There is know by nature that there ought to be a time, and that one
no foot of seven or a seventh part of time, but not the Seventh day
steps of it which the Scripture doth no where witness to, that alleged

is Rom. 2. Which speaks nothing to the thing, there is not
a word about the time of worship, especially not one day in
seven nor yet any where else, but tis a meer device, for it can
never be known but by Scripture or tradition , as also who
is the true God, or how many Gods, how to be worshipped,
whats his Name, as *Pharaoh* confessed when he sayd who is
the Lord , and whats his Name, I know not the Lord, *Exod.*

5. 2.

Obj. Obje^ct. But it may be it will be objected, that *Aristotle* knew
that there was one first being, that gave being to all things.

Answ. So many knew that the Seventh day called Saturday
was to be esteemed above other days, and therefore they dedicated it to the chief of their Gods *Saturn*, but that I may
clear that place *Rom. 1.* First consider it speaks not of the
words of the Law, but of the work of the Law that was written
in their heart; for the words of the Law as written either
in tables of stone or Books, that was formerly the *Jews* pri-
vilege who had it so committed to them, *Rom. 3.1.* to give
to others, *Rom. 9.4.* not to themselves, for it was the whole
circumcisions priveldge : no, but to them without doubt
Mark that who had not the Law, which were the Gentiles ; see and com-
pare *Rom. 2.12.14.17.18.19.20.* with *Ephes. 4.18.* *Rom. 9.5.*
Isay. 42.1.6.7. *Act. 26.17.8.* But the *Jews* inwardly, both
of the circumcision and the uncircumcision in the flesh, to
have the words of the Law written in their hearts; (for un-
der no other consideration can beleeving Gentiles chal-
lenge that promise, *Heb. 8.8.10.*) I say the words of the Law,
for otherwise the promise signifies nothing ; for because the
Gentiles had the work of the Law written in their hearts ;
but here is a further thing promised then what they had be-
fore. Now to this it may be objected , First

Obj. 1. That this promise is not to Gentiles but to the
house of *Israel* and to *Judah*.

Answ.

Ans^w. I think there is but a few that will object this ; yet I confess some I have heard, and they may as well deny us to be *Israel* and *Jacob* in relation to the new covenant and the promises as the precepts ; for when we come to them, many say we are not bound to them because given to *Israel*; but I hope they that will take but the pains to look into these Scriptures may see others besides the natural Seed to be *Jacob* and *Israel*, *Isay.* 44. 5. *Gal.* 6. 16. *Act.* 5. 31. *Psal.* 73 1. *John.* 1. 47.

Obj. 2. That if to the Gentiles tis not meant of the words of the old Law, but of a new Law.

Ans^w. If that be so let it be shewen and it suffices, but I don't remember a word of a new Law in all the Scripture, neither doth the promise say Ile write a new Law in their hearts.

Obj. But we read of a new covenant and thats all one.

Ans^w. No that doth not follow, for there is a difference betwixt a covenant and a Law, although the Law is sometimes called a covenant, for a covenant is an agreement betwixt two parties, but a Law is the will of one partie ruling and governing others.

2. By the promise of making a new covenant, there is not necessarily concluded the Law of the ten words renewing although they are called a covenant; because there are other covenants God made with them besides that, *Exod.* 6. 4. 5.

Chap. 24. 7. 8. Compared with the 12. vers. *Exod.* 34. 10.

3. That covenant that the Apostle calls the old covenant was faulty; but I chalenge the best of men to shew any fault in the ten Commandments as they are a Law, and if this were not it, what Law is it that was then in being that the Prophet saith was perfect ? *Psal.* 19. No sure, it was that Law or covenant that was to give life to such as sin by this Law had slain, see *Rom.* 7. 11. 12. compared with *Gal.* 3. 19. 21. Which was the Law of the Levitical Priest-hood. *Heb.* 7. 12 16 18 22. Law.

Chap. 8. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. But because it could not, it being impossible, as will appear from these Scriptures, *Heb.* 10. 1 2 3 4.

Chap. 9. 9. Therefore when the Seed came to whom the promise was made, who himself was the substance of all that shadow, for he was the sacrifice, the Altar, the high priest for ever,

ever, who offered up himself once for all, that so there remains no more sacrifice for sin; I say then the other vanished away.

4. The Substance of the Covenants do remain, although there is a change of some circumstances and accidents, see and compare Exod. 6.7.8. with Jer. 31.37, 34. and Heb. 8. yet there is such a difference as that it may be called a new Covenant: as the new Creature and the old, the same man substantially, but not circumstantially and accidentally, i.e. in respect of good accidents: I shall shew a little wherein they differ, as

1. In respect of the writing of the law, i.e. before in Tables of stone, but now in the fleshly Tables of the heart, 2 Cor. 3. Heb. 8.10. 2. At first so written as it could not abide for ever, but might be so broken as to come to nothing, (that is) in respect of those Tables in which they were written but these Tables are everlasting Tables.

3. As to the effects of the old, they might have the Law written and yet be ignorant of God, and had need that one should say to them know the Lord, but not so here, Deu. 4.10 Heb. 8.11.

Heb. 8.6. 4. In the promises, they were a temporal rest, in the land of Canaan, this an eternal rest, that a temporal covenant, this an everlasting, Jer. 31.10.

5. As to the grace, or pardon in case of the breach of it: under the old there was remission of sin, but so as there was a remembrance once every year, Heb. 10.5. but now so as that they are remembred no more.

6. In the subjects with whom he makes this Covenant, or the seed; the first the seed of the bond-woman, or fleshly seed, Gal. 4. but these are the spiritual seed or the children of the promise, born not of flesh nor of bloud, nor after the will of man, but of God, John 1.13. Rom. 9.8.

2. Reas. Because there needs a memento.

Ans. If so, then the first Commandment is nulled also; Eccles. 11.1. yea all the ten, Mal. 4.4. and hence it is evident that we are no lesse bound to remember the fourth than the other nine, but I rather think the memento preaches

eth forth Gods respect to it, and his fore-sight of mans dis-respect or neglect.

Because given to the Jews peculiarly with a peculiar reason; Deu. 5. 14. 15. Psal. 147. 19. 3. Reas.

Answe. 1. All the rest were as much given, and upon as peculiar a reason, yea the same, Exod. 20. 2. Lev. 19. 36, 37. and indeed hereby do I know that I am an Israelite indeed, and of the true seed of Jacob; (when all that are of Israel are not Israel, &c. Rom. 9. 6. 7. 8.) because he hath given his word to Jacob, i. e. his Law and his Statutes and Judgements to Israel, and he hath not done so by any people; that is written with his own finger, mark that, but so he hath done to the natural Israel written in Tables of stone, to the spiritual, written with the finger of the Spirit in the fleshly Tables of the heart. 2 Cor. 3.

Because we cannot know it from any other day by any natural instinct. 4. Reas.

Ans. No more can we know which is the true God, nor his true worship, Acts 17. 23. Gal. 4. 8. 1 Thess. 4. 5. nor yet who is his father or mother, nor who is his neighbours wife, and by this Argument all these Commandments must suffer shipwrack; but although Abimelech knew not Abrahams wife, Gen. 20. that Law reached him, so as he was in danger of his life: I wish others may take heed of the like danger, for taking away the Lords Sabbath to their use, although they know it not.

Because the penalties are not executed.

5. Reas.

Ans. This Argument will destroy also the 2. 3. 5. &c. because they are not executed neither, but that doth not follow, see Math. 15. 4. but the more shame for Rulers, that yet are so zealous to punish stealing with death contrary to the Law.

Because nature doth never convince any of her children of the breach of it, as Mr. Ives saith it hath done of all the other nine. 6. Reas.

For which the proof alledged is Rom. 1. 25. with some other Scriptures, which being examined speaks no such thing, but onely of Gods condemnation, and the Apostles, of such and not natures, and that it is the Apostles complaint Mr. Ives

Ives

Ives confesses p. 216. Therefore this Argument comes to nothing, seeing it cannot be proved that nature did or doth convince her children of the breach of the rest, neither can I see how she should, seeing as Mr. Ives confesses she had not the Law; now where no Law is, no imputation of sin, Rom. 5.12.13. men may sin although they have not the Law, but sin is not imputed where there is no Law, but what is this to Mr. Ives, or yet to the men of England, or any others that have the Law, and are under the sound of it daily? being written in all their Bibles, &c. and read in all their Churches, and preached, seeing the Apostle saith expressly Rom. 2. 2 that so many as have sinned in the Law, that is in the hearing of, as appears by the following words in the 13. verse, shall be judged by the Law, they must not think to do as they that have not the Law; and if any such shall do as Mr. Ives will, not obey but be contentious, truly it makes me to tremble to think what is threatened against such, whether they be Jewes or Gentiles, for there is no respect of persons with God: read and fear, from the 5. verse to the 14. and therefore let none say they are Gentiles, for its all one if thou once comest to be a hearer of the Law, therefore I beseech you all that shall read this, that you would so speak and so do as they that shall be judged by the Law, which is a Law of Liberty, James 2. 10. 12. Psal. 119.45.

7. Reas.

Because say they the Sabbath had a worship prescribed for it, but that cannot be known by nature; therefore nature binds us not to it.

Answe. This was not at first, see Gen. 2. Exod. 16. but when there were sacrifices for every day then for the Sabbath too, yea twice as much: but yet me thinks this would break down the Sabbath as much, and so destroy the morality, that they would have perpetuated; but we may find Sabbath dayes service such as Prayer, Preaching, Conference, Baptism, Acts 16. 13, 14, 15, and 18. 4.

Arg. 2. That which men are not able exactly to compute, by reason of the Sun's standing still in Joshua's time, and its going ten degrees back in Hezekias time, and in regard of the alteration of dayes, by loosing or getting so many minutes, and it being day so many weeks together in some places

&c cannot exactly be required, because impossible to be performed; but under such an impossibility lyeth the seventh dayes computation; therefore the observation of it cannot reasonably be required.

Answ. 1. I could wish that this kind of arguing did not burden or blaspheme, as to the making God unreasonable in his requirements; for first I pray consider, were not all these when God did certainly require it, did not God once require it of all naturall *Israel*, yea and that after *Joshuah* and *Hezekias* time too and was there not the same alteration of dayes then and had not the Sun the same motion in every Nation and were not they scattered into every Nation, see *Act*s. 2.5.8. *Ezek.* 5.10. But further,

If God did add so many hours to one day by a miraculous addition of time, this proves not but that the next day went on in the account of dayes, and if so though the Sun in that dyall of *Ahaz* was made to appear as going backward ten Degrees, yet when the Sun went down, that day was done, and the next day begun; and the day was exactly known after that, or the *Jews* would never have been so zealous for it, as *Nehemiah*.13.15.16.17.18. Neither could it else have been said that those women *Luke* 23.36. rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment; I say this was as much against the *Jews* whom all acknowledge were bound to keep the 7th day S. bbath.

2. But secondly, tis not said you shall keep holy so many hours or those very minutes, but the Seventh day.

3. But thirdly I wonder Mr. *Ives* and many others should be so zealous of the first day, nay I wonder how it could be said that Christ rose the first day, when it cannot be known by that count, or that their Sunday should be so much stood for to be the Lords day, or that any should be looked upon as such a wicked person when it is at as great an uncertainty, for what variations and mutations have there been since that was first appointed by their Church? yet that must remain infallible, but Gods instituted time uncertain.

4. But fourthly, at the hardest, we can answer all with this, if there be first a willing mind, tis accepted according

See Mr.
Ives upon
that place
*Act*s. 2.5.
in his
Book pag
35.

to that a man hath, not according to what a man hath not ; he that hath not a Father or a Mother shall not be condemned for not honouring of his Father or Mother ; so they that have not a distinct day , let them plead this, but twill be no plea to those that have, nor to those that may know, nor yet to those that keep that instead of it that both Jew and Gentiles, yea and their own consciences tell them is the first day of the week, when they may keep the Seventh day , according to the commandments.

5. And this may serve also to answer that Answer Mr. Ives, about loosing the knowledge of the day by sore distemper, or violent fit of a fever, or by travel; besides this still makes no more against the Gentiles then it did against the Jews in all generations, and truly in such cases a man must need the help of others information ; as also if a man should by the like causes loose the knowledge of his Father or Mother or Absurdity of his neighbours wife or the like.

But nice thinks this absurdity must needs follow, that if Gen.8.22, (as many say) the Sabbath and sanctity of a day remains as the morality of the fourth commandment, and the Seventh day should be abolished that should be abolished, that cannot till Heaven and Earth pass away, Jer.32.20.25. with Luke. 16.17. Seeing God in the commandment sanctified it, and therefore surely if there be any thing morall in it, it is the Seventh day which we see and know to abide. But if they say tis not the day but the sanctity of the day or the rest of it that is ceremonial.

I Answ. 1. That is that which they say is the morality of the fourth commandement, and there is no more in the fourth commandment but the Seventh day and the Sabbath or rest and sanctity of it; but if it should be further said that is not the Sabbath, &c. simply considered, but as it stands in relation to that day. I answer,

1. What God hath joyned together let no man put asunder.

2. What God hath sanctified let no man call common, till God do; Now if God hath any where either separated the Sabbath from the Seventh day, or called the Seventh day common which once he called holy, let it be shewn, if it cannot be shewn, let it not be affirmed any more, or if any thing

of this they say be true, let it be proved by some express Scripture, or else let them believe that express word of God that the Seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God ; me thinks the Lord himself makes a clear answer to all such as he hath redeemed out of the house of servants.

Quest. What day is the Sabbath?

Ans^r. The Seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; believe him he cannot lye, and his word abides for ever,
1. Pet. 1.

Obj. But what matter what day, so we keep one day in seven; the main business is my worship of God, and tis no matter which day I do it on.

1. *Ans^r.* Whether worship be the main thing intended in the fourth commandment, I shall not now dispute, although I know no Scripture saith that, neither do I believe it to be the affirmative part included in the second commandment, and I think I vary not from the judgment of the Godly wise in this my perswasion, and the fourth commandment chiefly if not singely relates to the Solemne setting apart of time there, to which time is the Seventh day if I can read; besides if that were so, then God did not Sabbathize or keep Sabbath, for whom did he worship when he kept the Sabbath ? nay I may say we are to worship God every day but not keep every day for a Sabbath, for he that so doth is not to be kept company with as being one that doth not work,² *I bes. 3. 11, 14.*

2. If it is no matter which day now, then there is some reason or scripture to be shewn, or else by the same reason one was as good as another then, when God commanded the Seventh day at first to be kept holy, and then why did the Lord require one day above another, yea why is one day yet respected above another ? oh take heed thou dost not oppose thy wisdom to Gods ; but let me tell thee one neither was nor is so good as another : and that for these Scripture reasons,

1. Because the day is a sanctified day, God hath given a sanctity to it yea he hath called it his holy day, *Ex. 31. 13. I say 58.* Now the gifts and callings of God are without reparation, especially where he hath no reason to revoke it; as

the objection declares, if it be no matter, why not the Seventh day, and that more safely seeing tis an holy day suitable to an holy God, holy worship and an holy people.

But secondly it is also a blessed day, *Exod.* o therefore destroy it not because there is a blessing in it, *Esay 55. 8.* a man or thing that is blessed is better then that which is not blessed.

3. It is the Lords day and Sabbath day, because Jesus calls it so, *Mark 2. 7.* *Esay 58. 12.* secondly because he himself kept it, or rested thereon, and mark, that is the reason in the Commandement, the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: Why? because in six dayes &c. and he rested the seventh day. Thirdly, because he appointed it or made it, *John 1. 3.* *Mark 2. 27.* and that for man indefinitely, for his good, both of soule and body.

No yoak
of bon-
dage.

Obj. It is not so now, it is a yoak of bondage.

Ans. It is not of it self, but as it is made so by others, that have changed his time, for what is there in it but is good and comfortable too, rest is good. *Issachar knew* (as sottish as he was) to couch between two burthens, *Gen. 49. 15.*

And I will appeal to every one that truly fears God, whether a time set apart from all worldly incumberances to worship the Lord in be not good, to serve God being perfect freedom, *Psal. 119. 45.* but it may be this is the hondage to some to be bound to serve God when he will, thou wouldest be left at thy liberty; whether that be from pride, or loosenesse of Spirit, I shall leave to the sober to consider, whether it be not as much a bondage to be bound to the true God, the true worship of that God, so that man cannot worship what God he will, and how he will judge: it is a bondage to the Adulterer to be bound to his own wife.

It may be the Rulers wicked Laws whereby they have set up another day instead of it, or else their making and appointing the Sabbath day for Faires or Markets, as it is almost in all the great places in England, is that which makes it thy yoak, otherwise there would be no tediousnesse in it, therefore blame them and not Gods Law.

*The Principles improved, for the Sabbath Nullitie and Abolition
examined and disproved.*

1. That it was never commanded by Christ our Prophet, whom we Gentiles are to hear in all things.
2. That it was never commanded under the Gospel, or ^{Princ. I.} in Gospel times, that is in the new Testament, especially after Christs resurrection, enely under the Law by Moses, whom we are not to hearken to.
3. That it was never at all commanded to believing Gentiles, neither can we prove that ever it was kept by any Gentile Church after the resurrection of Jesus Christ.
4. That the Sabbath is expressly Abolished, and now in Gospel times there is no Sabbath day at all.

The first Principle examined.

That it was never commanded by Christ our Prophet, whom we Gentiles are to hear in all things, *Act. 3. 22.*

Answer.

What Scripture is it that saith believing Gentiles under the Gospel must hearken; mark to nothing but what ^{Princ. I.} Jesus Christ himself spake, nay (although it is not denied disproved by me) yet let those that are so for expresse terms formally laid down shew if they can where it is at all said, that believing Gentiles must hearken to that Prophet, although *Israel* must, for he was to be raised up to them of their Brethren, not to us your Brethren as Gentiles, nay that of the *Heb. 1. 2.* unlesse you can prove the *Hebrews*, or the Author to that Epistle, Gentiles: but alas we can make our selves *Israel* when we list, and can believe what was spoken to, of, and for them to appertain to us, and when we list it is nothing to us: but surely this doing is not safe.

But secondly by urging this command of *Moses*, mentioned *Actis 3. 22.* upon us believing Gentiles, do you not destroy your own Principle, why according to you, what is that to us Gentiles, might they have said to *Peter* what *Moses* said.

3 Whether or no was it not the same *Israel* to whom this Promise was made, that were also by the same *Moses* commanded to keep the seventh day Sabbath; and whether they be not still bound, unlesse you can prove the making void the

the Law, or at least that Commandement.

4. It saith not to any that they should hearken to Christ in what he said in his own person onely, or what he should speak by his Apostles onely, and so not what he spake in his person at all, as some, allowing nothing but what was spoken after the resurrection of Christ, excluding all that he spake by all his holy Prophets since the world began; I say there is no Scripture warrant for all, or any of this, but to the contrary Paul teacheth, 1 Cor. 9. 8, 9, 10, 13, Rom. 14. 4. Acts 23. 5.

The second Principle examined.

Princ 2. That it was never commanded by Jesus Christ in the Gospel, that is, in the new Testament, especially after the resurrection of Christ, but onely in the Law by Moses, whom we are not to hearken to.

Answer.

1. I might first enquire of such whether there was not Gospel-preaching yea and Gospel times too, before the new Testament was written; although the Gospel did shine more clearly into all the world afterward? Heb. 4.

2. Whether there be any Scripture that saith, that believers are not to observe and do any thing, but what was and is written expressly in the new Testament; but especially after the resurrection of Jesus Christ?

3. Whether that be not to contradict what formerly was asserted, viz that we must hearken to what that Prophet Jesus Christ said; surely Moses did not exclude what he should teach as a Prophet whilst he was in flesh; besides, doth it not contradict the Apostle in the fore-mentioned Scriptures? Rom. 14. 1. &c.

4. Is not the seventh day Sabbath as much commanded by Christ as any of the other three of the first table? if ic be said they are implicitly and inclusively laid down; so is the Sabbath not onely mentioned, but commanded implicitly if not expressly, Math. 24. 20. Luke 23. 36. Heb. 4. 4. 9. 10. let the word in the ninth verse be rightly translated, as Mr. Carter of Norwich hath often been heard to preach, and many others, Mark 2. 27, 28. and many other places.

(23)

The third Principle examined

That however, it neither was there nor any other where Princ. 3. commanded to believing Gentiles, nor yet kept by any Gen- tile Church after the resurrection of Christ.

Answer.

1. If that term believing Gentile be stood upon, there is no such precise term in all the book of God, but to lay aside terms, if it were intended such Gentiles as were turned to God, i.e. to Gods worship, Ordinances, People, &c. then see expressly that there was one Law for them and for the Jew, Exod. 17. 49. see also Isay 56. 6. 7. that strangers were Gentiles, compare Ephes. 2. 11. 12. 19. Lev. 18. 26.

2. I would desire to know what Scripture it is that saith, that believing Gentiles are to believe and observe and do no more then what was (expressly) commanded to believing Gentiles; nay whether the Disciples which were Jewes were not commanded of Christ to teach them to observe and do all things what ever he had commanded them, to take care of the Sabbath being one, Math. 24. 20. but if it must not passe without an exact word of command to Gentiles, I would demand, where ever Jesus Christ, either in his own person or by his Apostles, did command any believing Gentile to go forth and Preach, and Baptize, nay where are they in express terms commanded to love the Lord their God, yea or that any did honour their Fathers and Mothers? so that if this kind of arguing were good, we might be stript both of many duties and privileges too, for I know no reason that we should lay claim to Israels privileges and promises, and not to Israels duties; especially such as neither are repealed by an expresse word, or by some substantial reason and ground, which I could never yet meet with, concerning the seventh day Sabbath, why Gentiles should not have as much need of a Sabbath now as ever the Jews had, whether they have not as much need of rest, and to worship God, and to have a time set apart to worship God in, and why that should not be as good a day or time, yea and better too still, for the reasons fore-shown I cannot see.

Mark this.

The fourth Principle examined.

That the Sabbath is expressly abolished, and that now in Princ. 4⁴ Gospel disproved

Gospel times there is no Sabbath, the Scriptures produced for proof are *Col. 2. 16. 17.* *Exod. 31. 17.* *Rom. 14. 5. 6.* *Gal. 4. 9, 10,* *11,* *Heb. 4. 2* *Cor. 3.* *Rom. 6. 14.* *Rom. 7.* *Gal. 3. 19 23, 24, 25.* *Gal. 5. 1.* *Heb. 10. 1.* *Rom. 10. 4.* *Ch. 8. 2.*

Answer.

Ansf. I.

I do think and know those that are so strict for a command in terminis, cannot from any one of these Scriptures, nor yet from all together, shew me that the seventh day Sabbath, which is so often called the Sabbath of the Lord our God, in distinction from all other Sabbaths, as in *Levit. 23. 38.* I say that it is abolished, no nor yet in any other place, or that it is a shadow; but because I am willing to receive the Truth if it lie in them as well as they, I have examined the Scriptures produced, but cannot perceive any such thing from them, and that others may see the mistake, I have here produced their examinations, as first

Col. 2. 16. *Col. 2. 16. 17.* although it hath the word Sabbaths in it, 17. tryed: (dayes being a supplement being not in the Original) yet doth it not necessarily enforce the generality, although it doth a plurality of Sabbaths, neither must that of more necessity be a shadow from the word, because its a Sabbath, then the whole Law of ten Commandements, from *Heb. 10. 1.* as the ignorant Quaker saith, because it's a Law, which is absurd to assert.

2. That this place doth imply more Sabbaths then *Isay. 13.* seems not to me, but there not the seventh day Sabbath, because verse the tenth to the word and Law of our Lord God, which can be no other then the Law of the ten Commandements which is often called the word or his word, see *Isay 8. 20.* *Psal. 47. 19, 20.* besides they are by the same Prophet in the same prophesie called to the Sabbath, *Isay 58. 13.* but this was that which was abominable to the Lord, that they would not have respect to that holy Law, but break it, and then to their sacrifices and Sabbaths, and so think to deliver themselves, and make God amends that way.

3. But further there are sufficient distinctions in that place to clear up the Apostles meaning, and to argue it not the 7th. day Sabbath as beginning the 13. verse from whence the argument is drawn, as.

1. They

1. They are ordinances there spoken of, but the Sabbath of the Lord is no where so called.

2. A hand writing, so not the Seventh day Sabbath; God himself writing it in the Tables.

Mark 2.

3. They were against us and contrary to us, but the Sabbath was made for man.

4. Neither was that nayled to the Cross and taken out of the way as those were, but was remaining still the Sabbath according to the commandment, but all those things that Luke 23. were the shadow of the body of Christ (as all those things mentioned in this place were) when that was hanged on the Cross, and nayled to it, rent, and after taken and thrown unto the Grave out of the way, then were they all so, see Col. 2.4.17.20.22. Ephes.2.15.16. Heb.10.20. So that the veil was then rent, and the new and living way was consecrated for us.

5. Those imply a neglect of the body, verse 23. This not, but mercy to man and beast.

If it must forbid all Sabbath because there mentioned, then all meats and drinks because there they are also mentioned.

The second Scripture alleadged is, Exod. 31.17. Where because the Sabbath is called a sign, therefore tis said tis a shadow, and done away.

Exod. 31.
Tryed.,

Answe. 1. There is a differance betwixt a sign and a shadow; Christ and his people, yea and the whole Law are signes, but not shadows, Isay 8,18. yea the Sun and Moon, Gen.1 14.

2. Whether or no are all signes made null and void?

3. Whether that which the Sabbath was a signe, may not as well relate to believing Gentiles as to the Jews? As first is not the Lord their God as well as the God of the Jew comp. Ezek.20,20. with Rom.3.29.

2. Hath he not sanctified them also, 1 Cor.6,11, Acts 15,9. Therefore why may it not be a signe to them as well as to others, God will bring such to his holy mountain, Isay 56,6,7.

The next Scripture is Rom.1.5,6. Where tis said one man esteemis one day above another, but another esteems every day alike, whence tis argued that every day is alike, under Tryed. the Gospel, &c.

Ans^r. It doth not say in words that the Seventh day Sabbath is abolished, neither is the Sabbath day mentioned there, nor yet can it reasonably be supposed it should be intended, it being part of that Law which he had before established, Rom. 3. 31. Commended Chapter. 7. 14, 16, 22, 25. and Chap. 8, 7. That he should here be speaking against it.

Obj. But saith Mr. Ives he means there the Law of faith.

Ans^r. If by the Law of faith he means faith, or else I know not what he meaneth; as the Apostle meaneth by it, Rom. 3. For that which he calls the Law of faith in one verse he calls faith in the other verses following, then it cannot be supposed by his speaking that he should go about to make void the Law of faith by faith; nor yet that, Rom. 7. he should there be speaking against faith, or the Gospel; nor that Law which saith thou shalt not cover, whereby he knew sin, the same Law in the third Chap. 20. verse, where he saith by the deeds of the Law shall no flesh be justified, for by the Law is the knowledge of sin: so that I say in Rom. 1. It cannot be imagined he should mean the Seventh day (in his every day) which is the Sabbath, it being a part of that Law: but speaking both of meats and days, and particularizing neither, in the fifteen Chapter he refers us to what is written afore time; which searching, we shall find that neither by meats nor yet by dayes can be meant all meats and dayes, but that it must be understood with a limitation, see Acts 15, 17, 19, 20, 21. Where the whole assembly of Apostles, Elders, and Bretheren of the Church in Jerusalem, the purest Church that ever was, yea and the spirit of God it self called some things necessary to be abstained from, although the Apostle is as large about this eating all things as in the other place about esteeming of every a like, yea and Acts 16.4.5. Himself gives these deecres to all the Gentile Churchs wherein and whereby they were established, therefore it cannot be meant of all meats, so neither may it be meant of all dayes, but of the six working dayes as they are called, Ezek. 46.1. which the Spirit of God means by every day, as in Exod. 16. comp. 4. with the 26. But further, it is concluded by all that ever

ever I heard speak about it, or saw write that tis spoken of such dayes and meats as are indifferent, but it appears from what was written aforetime, that so all meats nor dayes are; ^{Two great} duties neg but how ever there are two things in this place that are clear lected. duties which I could wish were more minded. First,

That no man is to be despised (according to you and the Apostle, if he did comprehend all dayes in this place) for keeping, and therefore we are safe in keeping of it doing no more then we may do; but whether you be safe in breaking is not certain at best, nay I am sure they do not well that so far despise the keepers of it as to deny communion with them.

Secondly none ought to put a stumbling-block or an occasion of falling in his Brothers way, either by using meats or dayes (for they are of the same nature in this place) whereby his Brother is grieved, see verse 15. For first tis evil to hate with offence, that which otherwise thou mayest eat, and so consequently to work with offence to thy Brother, verse 20, 21. Secondly tis uncharitable walking, verse 15. For thou thereby destroyest thy Brother that is his peace & comfort: Now the Apostle saith, 1 Cor. 13.15. If I had all faith and have not charity I were as nothing; Alas what wouldest thou have thy poor Brother do? if he eats that which he doubts he may not, if he works upon the day he doubts he is damnd; oh let all that have brotherly love take heed of breaking that great commandment that thou art sure is a duty, *Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thy self,* I hope if it were thy case thou wouldest not grieve thine own conscience, besides if it were thy case I know by my self thou wouldest that others should not prophane the Sabbath of the Lord, why now remember that rule of Christ, *What ever you would that men should do unto you even so do to them:* But we shall proceed to the next scripture Gal. 4.9, 10. In the next place is brought for the making void the Sabbath, where because the Apostle saith to the believing Gal. for that they did observe dayes and moneths and times and years he was afraid of them, &c. There he must intend and speak against the Sabbath observation.

Gal 4.9.
10. Tryed.

But first this answer would be noted that this was a Gentile Church, not Jews that had formerly worshipped Idols as is manifest, verse the eighth: And secondly that he was in

this place speaking to them about the service which they did to them which by nature were no Gods, unto which they were now turning again, verse the ninth , wherein they desired at least some of them again to be in bondage, which worship stood partly in observing of dayes and moneths and times and years : So that the Apostle was afraid least he had spent his labour in vain , although some others of them also desired to be under the Law, to whom also he speaks in particular, verse 21. Truly me thinks it was then even as tis now in many Churches, some turn out of the way of the Lord to one thing some to another and few will continue stedfast to the end ; now that in that place forementioned the Apostle must mean those Hetherish observations, besides the clear congruitie in the sence with the former verses, it will be manifested by this that the Jews were absolutely forbidden themselves to observe times Lev.19.26. Nay further it cannot be thought that he should here Judg so strangely of them for a dayes observation, except it were to their Idols, and Rom.14. Not suffer them that did it to be despised because they observed it to the Lord. But lastly, what it it should be there meant of Jewish observations, there was other days observed besides the Seventh day Sabbath ; yea, and it must as strongly strike at them that do now observe the first day or any other , and I might add this also, that it cannot be meant of Jewish observations, for I do not remember that the Jews were ever commanded to observe any moneths. Mr. Ives me thinks speaks poorly to say that their observation of new Moons was their observations of moneths; surely by the observation of dayes is meant of respect to one day above another, and it must be so of moneths, but they were to observe the day of every new Moon in every moneth , but not the moneth of every new Moon . but I wonder that men should dare to go about to make void part of the Royal Law of God by such dark , and at best uncertain suppositions seeing there is not one word of the Seventh day Sabbath, nor yet so much as the word Sabbath here.

**Heb.4.
Tryed.** Another Scripture alledged is Heb.4. From whence tis argued that the Sabbath is a type, although there be not a word that saith so in all the Chapter, neither can it be agreed

by

by the Asserters what it should be a type of; some I have heard say of the Land of Canaans rest, but then it should have ceased when they came into Canaan, for that's the force of their argument I suppose to have it cease when the *Antitype* came, but they were called to Sabbath observation when they were in it many years after by *David*, as the Apostle here argues, if *Joshua* had given them rest then would he not after have spoken of an other day, he would have mentioned no more Sabbath dayes then, but saith he after so long a time as they had been in *Canaan* he speaks of another day, saying in *David's* time to day if you will hear his voyce, and clears the Seventh day in which they worshipped God, compare the Fourth and Fifth verses, for he speaketh in a certain place of the Seventh day in this wise &c. and in this place, again that is in *Psalm 95.* the place so often quoted.

But secondly some others think it typed forth our rest in Christ, which he that believeth entreth, verse 3. *Answ.* if so then as soon as a soul comes to believe and so to enter into Christ he must cease keeping it which if true, I wonder that *Moses* who long before had believed in Christ, and had esteemed the reproches of Christ greater riches then the Treasures of *Egypt*, should afterward be commanded with the rest of the *Israelites* to keep Sabbath, yea the Seventh day, yea as soon as a Soul can come to keep it as he should, he must leave, truly this conceit would make much confusion, every time a soul did question whether he were in Christ he must be in adoubt whether he must keep Sabbath or no; I remmember *John Brayne* in his *Jews common-wealth*, who although he hath many excellent things concerning the Law, yet hath, this strange conceit about the Sabbath, that unbelievers are bound to keep the seventh day, but believers the first day for the Sabbath; thus do men when they walk in paths they know not most strangely go astray; what confusion such conceits (if followed) would bring, I will leave for the wise to judg.

But Thirdly others, it is the type of our eternal rest or of the thousand years wherin the Saints shal reign with Christ, whiles *Satan* shall be bound, *Rev. 20.* minding that word of *Pet.* One day is as a thousand years and a thousand years as one day, which I confess hath the most probability in it, although not

not without some doubt ; but if so, the type must abide till the Antitype comes, which suffer but to be, and I am perswaded when the Lord Christ come he'll shew us what to do with the Sabbath at that day : But fourthly me thinks the Apostle doth clearly argue the celebrazione of a Sabbath still to the people of God from two reasons, 1. First Gods resting from his work. 2. And Christs resting from his, as God did from his own, which was on the Seventh day, see verse 10. 1. And therefore he concludes, *Ἄρτι μεταβολὴ τῆς Σαββατικῆς κατατάξεως*. There remaineth therefore the keeping of a Sabbath to the people of God, and in conclusion having proposed the natural *Israelites* in their type of our eternal rest promised verse 1. doth caution us to take heed we do not fall after the same example of unbelief, they broak the Sabbath of the Lord *Exod.* 16. 27, 28. which was one cause of their falling in the wilderness *Ezek.* 20, 13.

Obj. It is objected by Mr. Ives that it cannot be meant of the Seventh dayes rest verse, 9. First because tis saith he a rest promised, and to prove it he goes to the first verse.

Ans^w. But know that those two verses spoke not of one and the same rest, may not I better say that the rest in the ninth is the same with the rest in the fourth verse, seeing the very reason of that rest is subjoyned with this verse 10. As part of the reason to enfore that; truly to me this seemes to be the argument of the Apostle, seeing that it is testified that God did rest the Seventh day from all his works, and Christ also did the same, & the entring into Canaans rest did not put an end to it, no nor to David though a believer, who had the Gospel preached as wel as we; so that he with a not withstanding all, said, to day lets come and worship and fall down and kneel before the Lord our maker, why then although they are under Gospel teachings also, and made partakers of the Heavenly calling, yet there remains the keeping the Sabbath to the people of God. But secondly Mr. Ives concludes it could not be the seventh dayes rest, but the eternal rest, because tis a rest provided onely for believers to enter into, but unbelievers might enter in the Sabbaths dayes rest, and so might their Cattell, and for this he brings the eleventh verse, and it is true, the eleventh verse doth indeed speak of that eternal rest,

rest, but not that in the 9th, nor that in the 4th, but tho Sabbaths rest, if I may so call it; which they that expect to enter into the other, ought to have a care to enter into, for want of which, those of old in part (as hath been shewn) failed of entering into their rest, and therefore he likewise cautions us; but I conceive the reason why he mentions the people of God, and not others, is because there is too great a readinesse in them to conceit, that in Gospel times there is no Sabbath to them, as is too too manifest, or else all this pains and much more might have been spared; but the Apostle doth plainly declare the contrary, verse the 9th.

Apro Xviij. ad Corin. cap. 1. v. 13.

As for all the rest of the Scriptures produced, they speak as much against the whole Law, which all say is yet in force, as against the fourth Commandment; onely there is a conceit running amongst many, that I hope are precious in the sight of God, That the Law as given by Moses is not binding to Gospel Saints, especially not to believing Gentiles, but onely as given by the hand of Christ, which I have already declared to be without Scripture warrant; for I do not read of the Lawes being given by any other but Moses the type of Christ, by Christ indeed in this type. But first I must say it was not so given by Moses as if he were the Law-giver, Author, or maker thereof, see *Isay* 33. 22. but onely as a Bishop Servant, and Typical Mediator to take it from the hand of God, to bring it and give it to the people, and this onely in respect to the Law as written, for God delivered it of Gods in words himself, immediately to the people, *Deu.* 5. 22. and not indeed I do not find that any part of it was so given by the hand of Jesus Christ to any one believing Gentile; no nor yet was it ever so much as written again by his own hand, Ministers that the Scripture mentions; 'tis true he spake many things or Angels, to the Jewes, and those from amongst them that he had chosen to be his Disciples, and so he spake these words of old to the Jewes whom he had chosen, *Act*s 7. 30, 31, 32, 34, taken, by *Heb.* 12. 24, 25, 26. and why that should not be as authentick consider that he spake first as last, I see neither reason nor Scripture for.

2. I do not find where ever the Law was given by Jesus Christ

15. 22, 23,

24, 25, 26,

27.

Christ any otherwise then it was before, neither ever is there any part of it mentioned with any respect to any new institution, either by Christ or any of the Apostles, but onely with respect to its being a Law before; yet I shall give

John 1. the Scriptures produc'd, a fair tryal, as *John 1. 17.* the Law
17. tryed. was given by *Moses*, but grace and truth by *Jesus Christ*: What this signifies as to the re-giving of the Law I find not; for either it speaks of the Lawes coming by Christ or not, if it do, then it speaks of another manner of the Lawes coming by Christ, then by *Moses* or nothing, and in truth looking into the Original, I find it thus, *in ἡμέρας τοῦ Μωϋσῶν εἰδότην, ἐχεπικεκρίθη αὐτὸν καὶ ἡμῖν χρήσιμον:* The Law was by *Moses*, but grace (that's the Gospel) and Truth (that's the Law, *Psal. 119. 142.*) was made by *Jesus Christ*; so that although the Law was given by *Moses*, yet both Law and Gospel too were made by *Jesus Christ*, or if it speaks not of the Lawes coming by Christ, then the place cited is nothing to the purpose, but onely a New Testament acknowledgement by the Spirit of God in *John* (that choice Gospel Spirit) that still the Law is owned as given by *Moses*, and not the Law but something else was by *Jesus Christ*, even that grace to sinners that had broken the Law, which could not be worth any thing to us Gentiles were we not under it, their second Scripture for this is, the *1 Cor. 9. 21.* where Paul saith

1 Cor. 9. 21. tryed. I am under the Law to Christ, the word in the Greek is *μὴ νῦν ἀρνεῖσθαι τὸν νόμον, αλλὰ ἵνα με χρεισθῶ:* being not lawlesse to God but in or according to the Law to Christ, I see no material difference betwixt God and Christ in this place, as there must be to make any thing of it; but this seems to be the whole of that which the Apostle urges, that although he had said before, that to them that were without Law he was as without Law, that he might gain them which were without Law, yet he would not have any to think that he were a lawlesse person towards God, but that he lived to Christ godly according to the Law; mark, he doth not say according to the Law of Christ, as if he had given a new Law, but the old, as he testifieth also to *Timothy*, that he served God from his Fore-fathers, or Progenitors, and therefore to my understanding this place makes rather against them.

A third scripture is *Heb.* 3. where ^{it} is said we must consider Heb. 3. 1, the Apostle and High-Priest of our profession, &c. and Christ ^{2, 3, 5, 6,} being (over, yea and) faithful in his houle as Moses in his, whence tryed. it is conceived he gave a Law to his house which houle are we, as Moses did in his, whereunto we onely are to hearken.

Answer.

We must consider what Moses house was, viz. the Tabernacle made with hands, which was a shadow of the body of Christ the true Tabernacle made without hands, and that either the body of his flesh, *Col.* 1. 22. or his mystical body, his Church, ver. 24. which house are we saith the Apostle, and indeed in reference to the house, and Law of the house, I do think we are to mind Jesus Christ the High-Priest of our profession, and not Moses Law, for his house the former Tabernacle, as may clearly be gathered from these Scriptures, *Heb.* 7. 12. 19. and Chap. 9. 1. 6. 9. 10. I pray mark that little word in the first verse also, which shews that this Tabernacle had ordinances of Divine service, &c. and truly this Christ taught his Disciples, that when they had taught and baptized persons, and so made Disciples, they were then to teach them all things that he had taught them to observe, *Math.* 28. 19. 20. but first they were to teach them to repent of the breach of the Royal or Kingly Law, by which he reigned over all the earth, *Psal.* 47. 2. 7, 8, 47, 48. *James* 2. 8. *Rom.* 3. 19. 20. Indeed I could not go and teach persons that were not made Disciples first, to observe the Laws of Christ is King over those he will rule of the Royal Law, that is the Law of the ten words whereby with rod all the world stands guilty before God, and to be baptized ^{of iron,} and break in pieces like a pot-^{ers vessel} *Psal.* 2. but not Priest save over his own done in truth and righteousness, *Psal.* 111. and established by the houses Apostle, *Rom.* 3. 31.

But lastly let this be minded, this is not spoken directly to believing Gentiles, but to Hebrews which were Jews, and therefore might

might be as well argued not to belong to us, if that way of Argument were good, but I approve it not.

Another Scripture produced against the Law as given by Moses, is that in 2 Cor. 3. where the Apostle calls the Law, say 2 Cor. 23. tried. they, the ministration of the Letter, and of death, and condemnation, and that it is done away, and that we are under the ministration of the spirit, &c.

Answer.

1. To which I answer: 1. That the Law is not expressly called a Ministration of the letter in this place, in opposition to the Gospel; but the ministring or giving of the Law only written or engraven in stones as Moses did, or in Books, or a bare Declaration of the letter of the Law, yea let me say of the words of the Gospel too, or whatever it be without the Spirit and Power, is but the Ministration of the letter; which is indeed a Ministration of Condemnation, let it be ministred by whom it will, whether by Moses or Paul: See 2 Cor. 2. 15 16. We are (saith the Apostle) the favour of Death to death to some. *Mark weare*, Whilst they were Preaching the Gospel, that is, in the letter only. I say, if there be no more but the bare Ministration of the letter: for men will yet with a notwithstanding that, love darkness rather than light, Heb. 12. 19 20. Ioh. 15. 20, 21, 22. Iohn 3. 18, 19. So that, that will only kill, but i. the Spirit quickeneth; that is, when the Spirit of Life and Power is ministred to; this is at this day too sadly experienced.

Obj. But if any shall say Paul did not minister the letter of the Law as it was given by Moses.

Anf. You may see it manifestly to the contrary, as to what ever part thereof he had occasion to treat of, although he had not occasion to speak of it all, yet whensover, and whatsoever of it he doth, it is both according to the Law and mostly from the Law, as Rom. 13. 9. and James 2. 8.

2. But secondly the Apostle saith not that the Law or letter is done away, nor yet the ministration of it, in all this Chapter, but onely the glory of the ministrations; and this not absolutely neither, for the Apostle still accounts it an high prerogative See ver. 7. 8, 9, 10. that the Jew had above the Gentiles by nature, Rom. 3. 1. but comparatively, it neither had, nor yet hath it any glory, by reason of the glory that excelleth; for indeed through grace I can

can I hope with many others bear a testimony, that although the ministration of the letter be glorious, yet the ministration of the spirit is rather glorious, whereby we can say we have it written by the finger of the Spirit of God in the fleshy Tables of our hearts, which is so transcendently glorious, that all the having it written in the Letter, or barely read or preached in the Letter, although we highly esteem it, it was as nothing, but let us to sit in darknesse till this came, so that I say it is not simply done away, but by an excelling glory, which the word in the Original shewes more fully, *επει τον καρπον δια* 2 Cor. 3. 11.

διεγενεται μετα μηλον την σογην, for if that is done away by glory, much more that remains in glory, or that remains in glory much more; so also that in the 13. verse compared with the 7. verse, is clearly meant of the glory of Moses countenance, that is, in that wherein was his appearance as to the ministration of the Letter, (which was not before he came) and that only to the Jewes, although I cannot say only, for the Jews, which was then such a rare and glorious thing as was admited, but alas the glory of this ministration was to be clouded and obscured, by being out-shined through the excelling glory of the ministration of the spirit and of power; as for instance, the ministration of the Letter of the word of prophetic, is the light shining but in a dark place, 2 Pet 1.19. Till the day dawn, and the day-star, that is the Sun of Righteousness, arise in our hearts by the ministration of the Spirit; for the ministration of the Letter may well be compared to the light of the Moon in the night, its shining is glorious, but in the day when the Sun shineth, although the Moon should yet continue in its clearest light, yet the excelling light of the Sun would so eclipse it, that it would have no light by reason of the glory that excelleth; yet this doth not follow, that the Moon must be no more when the Sun cometh, yea, that remains still but eclipsed, so here, &c. see this only carried to the heights of g'o y, set forth in that prophetic of Isay 30 26. so that this place is far enough from making void the Law, or ministration of the Letter either, but acknowledgeth it a glorious ministration, yet, only not, if compared with the ministration of the Spirit, see also Rom 8. 1, 2 3:4.

Rom. 6. Another Scripture alledged against the Law, is Rom. 6. 14.
14. tryed. where the Apostle saith that we are not under the Law, but
under grace.

Answer.

The Apostle is very carefull in this place of offering any violence to the Law, and would not have any think that he did intend any such thing, and therefore would not be so understood, as if he should mean that we were not under the Law, so as not to obey it; for mark, that is that he is arguing to all along, I say to the obedience of it as to a form of doctrine, and tells them plainly, that that very form of doctrine was delivered to them, and that they (being believers, and having it written in their hearts according to the new Covenant) had obeyed it from the heart, and so being made free from sin (that is the transgression of the Law) were become the servants of Righteousness, see verses 15-16, 17, 18. and Paul writing to *Timothy* that servants should honour their Masters, &c. that the doctrine of God be not blasphemed, and that he should withdraw from such as did not consent to it, see *1 Tim.* 6. 1, 2, 3, 5. and in that sixth of the *Rom.* and 14. is as I understand onely encouraging Saints to resist sin, that is, the transgression of the Law, *1 John* 3.4 both from their duty according to their profession of being dead to sin; which he argues from their being buried with Christ by Baptism, &c. and also from their priviledge they have, being under the dispensation of grace, which abounds where sin abounds, as in the 5. chap. 20. vers. and tells them that they should not need to fear their old man of sin, for that was crucified with Christ, he being made sin for us, and bearing the body of our sins upon the Cross, the vertues of which are conveighed to us that do believe and are baptized into Christ, and being under the dispensation of grace or the Gospel, which is the power of God to salvation, they might believe (that however it was before with them when they were (only) under the commanding power of the Law, which by reason of the weakness of their flesh *Rom.* 8. 3. could not furnish them with power to do what it commands them) and now being not under the Law onely, mark, but the precious assisting power of grace, sin should not have dominion of them, and therefore would he have them not yield their members to sin, but to righteousness

as those that are alive through grace to God; I lay these and many other Arguments he useth, and all to draw them to rebell against sin, and to cease to rebell against God, and his Law of Righteousness, which he goes on to do also in the 7. Chapter, which I shall speak to next, as being another Scripture brought against the Law as given by Moses.

Another Scripture alledged is Rom. 7. wherin it is asserted Rom. 7.
that the Law was our husband, and that the Law is dead, tryed.
and we are freed from the Law now; To which I answer
first,

1. That this is to be minded, that the Apostle is still carefull to clear himself of that which so many Father upon him, viz. of nulling the Law, for after he hath shown the worst of the Law, that is, the condemning and killing power thereof, and that from his own experience, least any should say that he knew not what it was to be under it, if he had he would never have pleaded for it, I was alive once without the Law saith he, but when the Commandment came sin revived and I died; And the Commandment that was ordained to life, I found to be to me unto death; yea and not onely so, but that the very motions of sin that were in his flesh, or old man, were occasioned by the Law, (we being apt to lust after that which is forbidden) and so wrought in his members to bring forth fruit to death, which sin was dead without the Law, so that there was no motions at all of it, ver. 8. I say yet notwithstanding all this, (mark well how he pleads the Laws cause) as first, negatively in the resolve to a question, What is the Law sin? as if he should have said what shall we say because evil motions that had such a sad tendency, as working to bring forth fruit unto death (whilst we were in the flesh, that is carnal) was by the Law occasioned, that therefore the Law is an evil Law and nought, God forbid; ver. 7. nay, saith he, that is so far from being sin, that I had not known sin but by the Law, I had not known lust except the Law had said thou shile not covet, no, he acquits and casts all upon sin and himself, and justifies the Law as just, holy, and good, yea spiritual, mark and admire, and therefore because he found it to be unto death to him, read verses 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. yea to the very end of the Chapter, professing that although he could not do it as he would, yet he consented to it that it was good,

Mark this
Paul could
not know
sin but by
the Law,
not by na-
ture, much
lesse the
Gentiles.

good, and that he delighted in it, yea and that with his best part, his inner man too, and that with his mind he did serve it, although with his flesh he served the Law of sin, and in the 8. Chap. 7. verse, saith that it was the carnal mind that was not subject to the Law of God neither could be, and therefore was enmity against God; so that all may see that the Apostle was no Antinomian.

But secondly you may take notice that the word Law is variously taken in this Chapter, as for the Law of God, of sin, of the husband, &c.

3. It is clear that the Apostle having by a similitude set forth the authority and power that sin had sometimes had over him and others of the Saints before it was slain by the body of Christ, compare Chap 6. 6. with the 4. verse of this Chapter, even such as an husband over a wife, we being even wedded to it; But now the Apostles Argument is this, by way of concession, first that though it be so with us, yet a wife is bound to the Law of her husband, no longer then her husband liveth, but if her husband be dead she is free from the Law of her husband, so that now that wherein we were held, which is our old man, or sin, as before was shown, by the body of Christ being slain upon the Crosie, where our old man received its deaths wound, we are free to be married to Christ, who indeed hath bought our freedom dearly, that so we should bring forth fruit unto God, see vers. 4. and Chap. 6. 18. 22. 2 Cor. 5. 15. so that the Law we are delivered from is the Law of sin, which was our husband that is now dead, compare with Chapter 7. 23. Chapter 8. 2.

Ob. But it will be objected, the Apostle saith that he is delivered from the Law, but that he is yet brought into Captivity under it, and is yet groaning under it.

Ans^w. 1. I answer, yea, as he is carnal, vers. 14. that is in respect of his flesh that yet he bears about with him, but not in respect of his mind or inner man, verses 22. 25. Chapter 8. 2.

Ans^w. 2. But secondly this you must understand, that the Apostle is letting them know, and periwading them to believe what is done for them in and by Christ, and how they are to count of themselves in Christ, as Chap. 6. 11. and that although

although they could not experience the full effects of the death of Christ, (the Eclipse of the glorious Sun of God) yet he tells them our old man was crucified with him; and as if he should say you may reckon it, for you shall as certainly find the effects of his death in you, as if it were already in your outward or old mans decay, 2 Cor. 4. 16. as for instance, the natural Eclipse of the Sun hath its influence upon many bodies unavoidably, but it is not seen of some time after, so this; and so much in answer to this Scripture also. I shall now speak to the next, which is Gal 3. 19. &c. from which Scripture it is urged, that the law Gal. 3, 19. was but added because of transgression, and to be our School- 23. 24. 25. master till Christ, and that we are no longer under the law, tryed. that is nothing to us since Christ the Law is made void, and we are now under Christ.

Answer.

Answ. 1. There is not one word in all the Text that saith that the law is made void, nay hear what the same Apostle saith, whilst he was treating of the same thing in his Epistle to the Romans, Rom. 3. 31. What then, do we make void the law through faith? God forbid, Yea we establish the law; mark, when faith is come it doth not make void but establish the law, and that is further manifest from these reasons,

1. Because the transgression of the law is sin still, 1 John 3. 4.
2. By the law is still the knowledge of sin, Rom. 3. 20. Chap. 7. 7.
3. Because those Christ came to redeem were under the law, Gal. 4. 5.
4. If it did not abide, yea and that to Gentiles too as well as to Jews, they could not both be under sin, and become guilty before God; but the Apostle argueth both Jew and Gentile to be all under sin, and also consequentially under the law, see Rom 3. 9. and he produceth a *scriptum est* for it, that is, it is so written, verses 10, 11, &c. and the very force of his Argument lieth in this, verse 19. that both Jew and Gentile being under the law, therefore whatsoever the law saith, it saith to them that are under it; so that if the Gentiles be not under the law, the Apostles law is invalid to prove them to be under sin, but saith the Apostle they are under the law, and being under it

the

the Law speaks to them also as well as to the Jewes, and convinceth them all of sin, so that every mouth must be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God; now can any man think that he writes one thing to one Church of the Gentiles, and another thing to another, no surely, onely this is all, that he would have them know that no flesh living, that is, neither Jew nor Gentile can be justified by the works of the Law, because by the Law is the knowledge of sin.

Answe. 2. Having thus shewed you that the Law neither is nor can be abolished, i. e. the law of the ten Commandments, whereby is the knowldege of sin; in the next place I vwould endeavour to prove that the lavy mentioned in Gal. 3.19. and so forwvard in that Chapter, cannot be meant of this lavy of the ten Commandments, but of the Ceremonial lavy, or that lavy that vvas the lavy of the Priest-hood, vvhich shadowed Christ.

1. Because the law here mentioned was not till four hundred years after Abraham; but will any say that the law of the ten Commands were not till then? might Abraham have any more gods but the Lord, make graven images, and bow down to them and worship them, or take Gods name in vain and not have sinned? did not Cain sin in killing his Brother, and Abimelech in coveting Abrahams vwife, &c. before that?

Ob. Those lavyes vvere all written in mans heart by nature, and are in their inward nature and quality good, before any external constitution passed upon them, secluding and abstracting the positive law, or external imposition of the law-giver, as Bishop White in his Treatise of the Sabbath day, in his two first Characters of his precepts simply morall, which to prove he brings Aristotle in his Ethicks; I confess, in the reading of it I thought, he wanting divine Scripture proof for these Positions, must be forced to run to Heathens for proof for such heathenish principles, I am sure Paul saith he had not known lust if the law had not said thou shalt not covet, Rom. 7. and he saith, that he was alive once without the law, but when that Commandment came, then sin revived and he died; and if this had been resolved into the dictates of nature, he might have known it without the law; for my part I must say I could never have known that I must not have had any other gods but one, if

if the Law had not said it ; nor that I might not have made graven Images, if the Law had not said so; nor that a man should have had one woman to wife , and that it had been a sin to have had all common, as nature teacheth beasts; if the Law had not taught otherwise: See if the Apostle saith not so of what men know naturally , *Jude* 10. 2 *Pet.* 12. 12. that tis as the knowledge of bruit beasts , and truly men though they be in honour, and understand not the Law of God, are but like beasts that perish, *Psal* 49. 20. And let the sober well consider whether the Bishop (wanting the holy Scriptures to prove his Argument, and if that be as he saith, the Doctrine of the Church of England also;) doth not both condemn himself and the Church of England as erronious in his fifth Thesis, which is this, Topical or probable Arguments , either from consequence of Scripture, or from humane Reason ought not to be admitted or credited; His reason is, because the medium or ground of such objections is not necessary but contingent, and so dubious; and cause one-ly opinion and not divine faith. So that this is but the Church of Englands and her Bishops opinion , and not any point of divine faith that he hath asserted about these Nine Commands pure Morality, in opposition to the fourth : nei-ther can I see any thing of truth in the Bishops Assertion in his 4th Thesis, but a meer falacy , When he saith that the consentient and unanimous testimony of the true Church of Christ, in the primitive age thereof; (at least according to his meaning by the Primitive Church in his 2d Thesis; to wit, not the Churches that was in the Apostles dayes , but afterward) I say, that that should be the *Canalis* or Conduit-Pipe to derive and convey to succeeding generations the ce-lestial water contained in the holy Scripture, but tis appar-ently a relique of that Popish Principle, whereby that conceit is maintained, that The Church cannot err, and that we must believe as the Church believes, and the trick whereby all those Innovations and Traditions of men are foisted into the Church, reproved by Christ of old, *Mattb.* 15. 9. So that I cannot consent to the Bishop for these reasons.

1. Because the Scripture doth no where assert it , and therefore according to the Bishop, tis but an opinion , and not a point of Divine faith. F
2. Be-

Acts 21.

2. Because the Church may err, yea and hath erred; yea the truest Church that can be shewen in the Scripture, (at least from Bishop White, and the Church of England.) for the first Church at Jerusalem were all zealous of the Law, yea the eminentest Apostle of that Church erred: *Gal. 2. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16.* yea and but few of all those Fathers mentioned by the Bishop, but did err in some things.

3. Because there was to be a falling away, *2 Thes. 2.*

4. Because this is that which of old brought in all the traditions of the Elders that Christ reproves, as before, *1 Pet. 1. 18. Matt. 15.*

5. Because the Elders and Ministers could never agree in all ages, but were frequently of various judgement; and how shall we know which of them had the truth, but by going to the Fountain it self? That this last is true, let any but read those few testimonies that the Bishop hath cited, and you shall see the confusion of judgements; as it is also at this day in the Churches of England.

6. Because but few of them but contradict themselves as the Bishop himself hath done, and Mr Ives whilst he is writing against the holy Sabbath of the Lord.

So that it will still be best to hearken to the Lord, who biddeth us go to the Law, and to the Testimony; not of the Church, but of the Scriptures, which are they that testifie of Christ, *Ezay 8. John 5.* for we know that every word of God is pure, but tis not said in all the Scripture that every word of the Church is pure; and so shall we be Christs Disciples indeed, if we do whatever he commands us: Neither do I know such a thing in Scripture as a positive command, and a Natural Moral Precept, but all are positive precepts that are binding all men, and external too; and the Bishop is mistaken in his supposition, because we finde such and such things, as Loving of Parents, Hospitality, Charity, and Fidelity, &c. to be done as good, honest, and virtuous actions, before the Law was given to *Israel* on Mount Sinai; that therefore they must be a Law in nature secluding the external imposition of the Law-giver; for then, *Abels* first-fruits, and *Abrahams* Sacrifice, and *Jacobs* building of Altars to the Lord must be so too; for they were also before those things were com-

commanded *Israel*: but I shall not further enlarge in this.

Object. But it may be further objected, That the Sabbath was not before, though the rest of the Law was: To which I answer by way of querie.

Answ. 1. Can it be supposed that by the Law *Gal* 3. should be meant onely the Sabbath? If so, I would desire any to shew me where the Sabbath exclusively is called the Law in all the Scripture?

2. But Secondly, That the Sabbath was before, is manifest *Gen.* 2. But Mr *Ives* I remember objects, that although its there mentioned, yet not then sanctified nor kept till afterward; but my dear brother *Tillam* having sufficiently answered that objection in his answer to Mr *Ives*; I shall say the less to it, but tis manifest that when God rested on it, that he blessed it, & sanctified it, and made it for man, &c. and he did but make it known to the *Jews*, as was shewn before, *Neb.* 9. 14.

Object. But it was not written before.

Answ. No more was any of the rest of the Nine, nor yet the Covenant that the Apostle saith was 400 years before the Law there intended; therefore it cannot be meant of the writing of either, for one was not written 400 years before the other.

Object. Although the Sabbath was before, yet it was not as a Law to any, nor are any condemned for breaking of it till *Moses* time.

Answ. If you mean tis not called in particular a Law, no more is any of the other Nine; nor yet can it be proved that they were all kept, nor any reprobred for the breach of half of them; but therefore that doth not prove that they were not a Law before.

Ob. But the Apostle saith there was no Law before, *Rom.* 5. 13.

Answ. That must needs be understood of no Law written, or else he contradic~~s~~ himself; for first he saith, Where there is no Law, there is no transgression, *Chap.* 4. 15. But he saith in this Chapter, That till *Moses*, sin was in the World, and that all had sinned and come short of the glory of God, Verses 12. 13. which could not be if there had been no Law, neither written nor by Tradition, *1 John* 3. 4. But so much for the first Reason why it cannot be meant the Law of the Ten Commandments, because it was not till 400 years after *Abraham* had his Promise made. But Secondly,

2. The Law here mentioned cannot be intended the Law of the ten commandments because it was added, because of transgression, but where the Law of ten commandments are not there is no transgression; I know Luther and others have conceited it to be meant of the ten words that sin might be the more known and seen, and for illustration hereof they produce Rom 7.13. and chap .20. But either these places agree not to the same Law, or else it clears up this that the adding of the Law intendeth nothing but the writing of it, which I shewed before could not be, because then it could not be four hundred years after the covenant if it were before, so that I say it cannot be meant of the Law of ten words, although I do not deny but that having of the Law written, makes the sin the greater, but this place speaks not of any such thing, but only of a Law that was added in stead of Christ till he should come, viz. The Law of sacrifices for the taking away of sin till Christ the perfect sacrifice come.

By adding this supposed a not being before.

But thirdly, It could not be the Law of ten words because it was added but till Christ, verse 19. But will any dare to say that the Law of the ten words was but till Christ, or any one of them beside this which they suppose, and then if not, this fourth commandment must be the Law here spoken of, which cannot reasonably be thought; but if so when Christ came then we might have more Gods then one, make to ourselves Idols and worship &c. But it perhaps will be said, no, Christ hath forbidden all them, I have already shewn the mistake of such a conceit, but however all the time from his coming till he did, which when that was, none can shew, men could not sin at all, because there was no Law, but it is manifest the contrary from Christs own words, he came not to destroy it, but fulfill it or do it, and hath witnessed that till Heaven and Earth pass away, not one jot nor tittle was to pass from the Law, Luke. 16. 17. Yea till all be fulfilled, that's enough, till all the Law and Prophets be fulfilled, but they are not yet till the resurrection and eternal judgment be passed, besides he doth not say till all be fulfilled by me, but in the same s. of Mat. he spake of others fulfilling of it, saying whoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments and teach men, so shall be called least in the Kingdom of

of Heaven, let all men take heed what they do therefore in this cause: but Fourthly,

4. This Law in *Gal. 3.19.* was ordained by Angels in the hand of a Mediator, but so was not the Ten Commandments; for God both spake them immediately to the people, *Deut. 5. 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27.* Chap. 4. 33. and wrote it immediately with his own finger, and gave them to *Moses* himself, he did not give them to Angels to give to *Moses*.

But Fifthly, This Law was ~~ταύτης εἰς χριστόν~~, that is a Teacher or Instructer of children into Christ, till faith came, that is, till the Gospel in more clearness came to be Preached; but this cannot be meant of the Ten words, they speak not one word of Christ, its that Lawes work to convince of sin, *Rom. 3. 20* but speaks not a word of a Saviour, or of any possible means of any salvation, that was the work of the Ceremonial Law, or Law of the Priest-hood, by its Sacrifices for sins cleansing, &c. which Law was not till 400 years after the Promise made to *Abraham*, and was indeed added because there was transgression against the Law of Ten words, for the taking away of sin, at least to the purifying of the flesh, *Heb. 9. 1.* and was ordained to be administered by Angels or Ministers in the hand of the Mediator of that Covenant, and was to remain till Christ came and had taken away sins for ever by one perfect Sacrifice.

And this was indeed an Instructer into Christ, for all of it pointed at Christ; and this is also Mr *Wilsons* judgement in his Dictionary, and others also; and now there being a change of this Priest-hood, there was of necessity a change of the Law thereof, and this is that Law that they that were circumcised were bound to keep, Chap. 5. it being the carnal or fleshly Commandement contained in Ordinances, which to be under, was indeed a yoke of bondage, respectively at least; that is, in respect of the liberty of the Gospel: because it required great, & hard, and chargable services, and yet could make nothing perfect, *Heb. 7. 19.* Chap. 9. 9. Chap. 10. 1, 2. But let me correct a fault in the Translation in the 2d Verse of the Tenth Chapter: For then they would (not) have ceased to offer, &c. But (not) is not in the Original, neither can it in the sense; but that only
by

by the way, I hope I have spken and shewn sufficiently the mistake of this Scripture also, and that it cannot be meant of the Law of Ten words, called the Moral Law; but of the Ceremonial Law, which was a shadow of good things to come, and the body of Christ. But I am sure there is a Law that was before faith came, that faith doth not make void, but establish, Rom. 3. 31. and if that be any other but the Ten Commandments, let it be shewn.

Rom. 10.
4.

Tryed.

Another Scripture much produced is, Rom 10. 4. where the Apostle saith that Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness to them that believe: From which tis argued, that Christ put an end to the Law, even of the Ten Commandments. To which I answer:

1. First tis more than the Scripture saith that he put an end to it, but he was the end of it.

2. But secondly, He doth not say that Christ was the end of the Law of righteousness, which is the Ten words, for all they are righteousness, Psal. 119. and did Christ come to put an end to righteousness? No sure, he came to put an end to sin, Dan. 9. 24. So that when at any time it be asked whether Christ put an end to the First, Second, and Third Commandments, &c. they answer with the old unscriptural shift, as given by Moses; but doth the Text say, that Christ was the end of the Law as given by Moses? No sure, but He is the end of the Law for righteousness to them that believe. Indeed the end of the Ceremonial Law was for the bringing in of righteousness to such as had transgressed the other Law of Ten words; now Christ did that, to them that believe: So that he was the end of the Law for righteousness, but did not put an end to the Law of righteousness, but it abides firm for ever: As Luther also consents to in his Commentary upon the Galatians, fol 153. which added, and many others.

Another Scripture I have sometimes heard produced is Heb. 1.12. Whence it is gathered how the Eternal God spake of old, yet now he hath spoken to us by his Son, and we are to hear him in all things and not Moses, alas what poor sorry conclusions are here, how little of all this can be gathered from this place? is not this as if a School-boy should say when

he

he comes to the teaching of the Master of the Schoole, being brought in to the higher formes, I must now regard what my Master teaches me, I must not regard any thing of what the other taught me; yes verily the Master expects he should not forget but observe those Rules too, when we are come to the teaching of the Master of assemblyes, Eccles.12. so heres not a word that we must not harken to any, but to Christ although God hath spoken to us by his Son and that we are to heare him, and he had bidden me to have hearkned to Moses, nor have regarded to do what the Law did command, I should certainly have harkned to him, but seeing he did not, but bad that if we will enter into life, keep the commandments, Mat. 19.17. Rev.22.14.16. I look upon it as my duty to keep the commandments, and seeing he bid to hearken to Moses; yee have Moses and the Prophets heare them, I so shall do by the grace of the Lord Jesus, and think he errs from the teachings of Christ that teaches otherwise; if it be said, tis true Christ did so to the Jews.

I answer, so this was written to the Heb. which were Jews, but yet you are really to conclude that also to the Gentiles: but so much for answer to this Scripture also; I think I have answered all those Scriptures that I have met with, either against the Sabbath in particular, or the Law in general, I shall yet examine a little further Mr. Ives argument and such others as I have met with.

Mr. Ives argument is this, if the Seventh day Sabbath be binding to believing in Gentiles, tis either by the Law of example Nature, Moses or Christ.

Answ. I know not well what Mr. Ives and others mean by the Law of nature, I do not remember that the Scripture speaks of such a thing as the Law of nature; I read indeed of some that did by nature the things of the Law, but of the Law of nature I find not; if there be such a thing it must either be that Law that is in our members, Rom.7. Or else the Law of God, if the Law of sin, I must not obey the lust of the flesh, if it be the Law of God, it is either a known Law and written, or else some unknown and unwritten; if the last I know it not, if the first the Law of God written, its either some Law was given by Moses or Christ, and therefore why doth he call

call it the Law of nature, doth the natural man understand the things of the spirit of God? surely no, Cor. 1. 11. 2 13. 14. By nature a man knows not God, nor his Law, and therefore the Gentiles are said to be without Law.

But to the Second, the Law of Moses, if he means the law that was given by Moses in writing, to the People of Israel as the oracles of God, Rom. 3. 1. I mean those books of Moses that are called so often the Law of Moses, Act. 28. 32. 1Cor. 6. 9. Luke. 24. 44. I say that then they are bound by the Law of Moses to keep the Seventh day Sabbath, as I shall endeavour to make manifest anon, but I shall first answer his arguments against it, First for which he brings Psal. 147. 19. 20. they are not known by the Law of Moses, because saith he it was not given to any Nation, save to Israel.

Answe. Not (vs) it was given to Israel.

1. Not spoken with his own mouth as to them.

2. Not written in Tables of stone, as it was to them by Gods own finger.

3. Not in that way of mercy as to them, as a blessing and privilege as to his chosen ones; you have I known of all the Nations of the Earth you are mine.

4. He had not then done it, for the time of that grace and mercy to the Gentiles was not yet, but he doth not say in that 147. Psal. that he would not, but on the contrary he promised he would, compare Isay. 8. 20. Pro. 6. 23. Psal. 119. 105. with Isay 9. 1, 2. Chap. 60. 3. Isay. 51. 4. Chap. 42. 4. Micah. 4. 1, 2.

And therefore the Apostle saith, Rom. 9. 4. That this was one of natural Israels privileges to have the giving of the Law, now to whom should they give it if not to the Gentiles, that they for want of it were called a foolish people, Rom. 10. 19. comp. with Rom. 21. 13, 14, 15, 16.

And therefore did Jesus Christ will repentance and remission of sins to be preached to all Nations in his Name, Luke 24. 47. Now we know that repentance is a turning from all sin, and sin is the transgression of the Law, so that this is that in fuller terms that Christ willed that they should teach the Gentiles to turn from the breaking of the Law, which Law they had shewn them along while before, that, see Act. 15. 19. 21. But so much in answer to the first reason.

that is he
had not
then
given
them to
be wri-
ten or
preached
to them
for so the
word is.

Deut. 32.

His 2d reason is, if Moses Law be in force then the punishments are in force that are due to the Breach of the Seventh day Sabbath &c. which saith he cannot consist with liberty, nor with love and charity. To which I answer,

1. That the whole argument is false, for first a man may be bound to keep it and that by the Law of Moses, that is by those writings, and yet not be subject to the punishment of it, for we read of the Sabbath before of a penalty was shewn as Exod. 16. For that's a Law by it self that the Apostle saith was not made for the righteous, but for the disobedient; 1. Tim 1. 8, 9, 5.

But 2. we know that the judgments of God are according to truth, against such as commit such things, Rom 2. 1. 2. whether Jew or Gentile verse 9. 15. 18. And the time shall come that the Saints shall execute the judgements written, and the Apostle saith in Rom. 2. That all that live in the Law, that is in the hearing of the Law (comp. verse twelve with the thirteenth) shall be judged by the Law, and if men be not doers of the Law they shall not be just before God although they be hearers of it; and whereas he makes a noise to scare babes with all, that there is none to inflict, I say Magistrates ought to be a terror to evil doers and we ought to be afraid of them, if we do evil and break the Law (I mean of God;) for the 3. Children were not afraid of the King though they would not obey his Law, Dan. 3. Now I would know of Mr. Ives whether Magistrates can be a terror to evil doers if they have not power to punish evil doers, and whether they are to punish them according to Gods, or according to their own will? and whether Gods Laws are equal, and mans unequal, Ezek. 18. 25. But I confess the Lords punishment for Sabbath breaking was very unequal, viz. To put men to death, if the Magistrates have been equal to pay five shillings, the Lord deliver us from such Babilonish Merchants, but I do freely testify to the World that Gods wayes of punishing of transgressions although with death are equal, and mans wayes are unequal, and that God never intended Rulers to be Law makers, but to see Gods Law executed, and so to reign by him, that by his Law in so doing they should acknowledge God to be the King over all the Earth Psal. 47. And to this doth James agree 22. 1say 33.

we have one Law-giver who is able to save and to destroy, Jam. 4. 12. But Mr. Ives would have you believe that to have Sabbath-breaking punished with death is against liberty: it seems Mr. Ives would be lawless, or at least under such a Law as might not be a terror to evil doers; what doth he mean by liberty, liberty to sin? if so I confess that is against him, and if Mr. Ives be for liberty to sin, he had need plead stoutly against the Law of God, for that allowes no sin; but if he means liberty from sin, it is no more against that, then for men to be put to death for murder, adultery, dishonour to parents, Math. 15. 4. indeed I find in that Chapter some that were for liberty from that Law, ver. 6. but I think Christ doth severely reprove such, ver. 7, 8, 9.

But further Mr. Ives saith it is against charity, methinks if it were against either liberty or charity now, it was so then, and to those that then were under it; but methinks these two things must follow such a conceit. 1. That the God of love intended the breach of love when he appointed this Law at first, and so should contradict himself, by commanding them to love their neighbour as their self, and yet not to have them according to Mr. Ives. 2. That the Saints of old could not be in love that owned such a Law, but certainly to love truly either God or a Brother, is to keep the commands of God, and his commands to such are not grievous, as I perceive they are to Mr. Ives; so that with a notwithstanding Mr. Ives scare-crow, I do judge that the Magistrates are to convict, and the people, and the witnesses first to inflict and execute the judgement written, and may count it their honour too, Psal. 149. 7. 9. but let me mind you of this, that it is no more every one that works upon the Sabbath day then every one that kills a man, but he that doth ought presumptuously, Numb. 15. 30. Exod. 21. 12, 13, 14. Deut. 1. 43. chap. 17. 12, 13. neither did the Lord order all to be put to death that had done it, till the law was published and made known to be that that should be put in execution, that so Mr. Ives should thereby scare people, see Exod. 16. Nehemiah 13. although all Israel were guilty of the breach of it, they were not put to death, because it was not done by them presumptuously, as it is not by many at this day, but we may say at least of many as Paul did of those that murdered Christ, had they known it they would not have done it.

2 John. 5.
1, 2, 3.

By what Law do they put men to death for murder, but the Law of Moses. 1 Cor. 2. 8. 3. But

3. But thirdly Mr. *Ives* saith, that if *Moses* Law be in force to require any thing that is not expressly and particularly required of them by Christ or his Apostles, then we may by the Argument of *Moses* Law bring in all Judaical Ceremonies; To which I answer, not so, because they are expressly null'd by the Apostle, as in forbidding Circumcision, upon which they all did hang, *Gal.* 5. 2, 3, *1 Cor.* 7. 18. 19, *Col.* 2. 14. 16. 17, *Ephes.* 2. 14. 15. and shew plainly that it was to be but till the time of reformation, *Heb.* 9. 8. 9. 10. and that if the Levitical Priest-hood be changed, there is a necessity of changing of the Law thereof, *Heb.* 7. but if Mr. *Ives* can but shew me one word of the ten Commandments null'd, by any one word of the Apostles, or Jesus Christ, or that there is any necessity of so doing, I shall be silent for ever, but till then I shall conclude with *James* the Apostle, that he that keeps the whole Law and yet offends but in one point, is guilty of all; that is of that Law whereby murder and committing adultery and blasphemy are forbidden, mentioned by him in that Chapter, *James* 2. 7. 10. 11. and shall desire so to walk as one that must be judged by that Law, which is a Law of liberty, *Psal.* 119. 45. and those that walk in it walk at liberty. 1. from sin, 2. from wrath, 3. from conscience condemnation, 4. and from any just accusation of men, and condemnation of any Ruler, or of any Saint; but I shall leave this Argument and proceed to his third, viz. That the Gentiles are not required by Christ, and his first reason is because he hath not required any such thing in all the new Testament, &c.

1. To which I answer, What if that were true, What Scripture saith that we are to do nothing but what we are commanded by Christ in the new Testament, if we can prove it commanded in the old, unless the old be renounced by Mr. *Ives*, which if it be, I judge it not safe to be of his opinion; I am sure *Paul* was not of his opinion, *Heb.* 12. 5. *1 Cor.* 9. 10. nor Christ, *Math.* 7. 12. nor *James* chap. 2. 8. but it is not a very hard thing to prove out of the New Testament, as may be hereafter.

2. His second reason why Gentiles are not bound by Christ, because the Apostle tells us that there were Sabbaths that were a shadow of good things to come, which he saith must needs be

be understood of Sabbath dayes, but to that I have answered sufficiently, as I judge before, as also to all his other reasons, and therefore I shall mention them no further, but shall proceed to speak a little positively.

I shall now endeavour to prove that the keeping holy the seventh day Sabbath of the Lord our God, is binding to be - living Gentiles, but I shall premise a few things,

1. That all duties are not alwayes formally laid down in the way of a command, see *Act. 13. 4.* but men are to do what Christ saith, *Luke 6. 46. 47.*

2. That all that are commanded to observe the Law of God, have not their names inserted in the Book of God, nor yet their Nations.

3. That when a Law is once given, and written, and not expressly for such a certain time onely, it abides in force till it be repealed, and needs neither a re-institution, nor yet a confirmation, but is firm without an annihilation or repeal by the Law-giver.

4. That what the Lord at any time gave to the Jews, or the seed of Jacob, he did intend it to the Gentiles that would joyn themselves to the Lord, and call themselves by the name of Jacob, *Exod. 12. 49. Numb. 9. 14. Joshua 8. 33. 34. 35.*

5. That God did never give the Gentiles any law in particular distinction from the Jews, but when the Lord of his grace was pleased to call the Centiles also into the knowledge of himself, he broke down the partition wall that was between Jews and Gentiles, and made them both one, *Ephes. 2.* so that now those Gentiles that believe are made fellow Citizens with them, and of the household of God.

6. That till the Gentiles came to this priviledge also, they were counted as without law, *Rom. 2.* that is lawlesse, which was a sad perishing condicione, for they did perish without it.

7. That although they were without it, it doth not therefore follow, it was not made for them, see *1 Tim. 1.* that were without law, neither doth it follow that that law hath nothing to do with them, as for instance, the same were sometimes without God in the world, *Ephes. 2. 12.* but this doth not follow, that God had nothing to do with them then, nor they with God; although they had not the clear knowledge of him, nor true

fear

fear of him, nor true love of him, nor true hope in him; so ^{1.} That although they had not the full knowledge of the Law, nor fear of it, nor love to it, yet it had to do with them, and this may appear, that the Gentiles were under the Law.

Gentiles
were un-
der the
Law.

1. Because it spake to them all whatsoever it said, and laid *Reas. 1.*
them all also as well as the Jew under guilt of sin, see *Rom.*
the 9. to the 21. and that before God.

2. Because it was made for such as before, *1 Tim. 1.9.*

3. Because if they came where the people of God had power to reach them, they were to be punished as the Jew for the breach of it, see *Lev. 24.16.22. Exod. 12.19.* although they were not proselyted nor joyned with them. *Neh. 13.21.* if he were but a bare sojourner among them.

4. Because God himself did punish those that were not of them that did not keep it, *Lev. 18. 24, 25, 26, &c.* and it was their impurity, which could not be if they had not to do with the Law, nor it with them.

5. Because otherwise, either they had some other Law from God, in which they stood to God, or else they could not be sinners against God, at least as to any actual transgression; and if so, I would desire any to shew me that Law by the Scripture, but if it be not in the Scripture, how shall the dead be judged out of that which was written in the book, *Rev. 20.12.*

6. Because Christ came to redeem them also, and such as he redeemed were under the Law, *Gal. 3.*

I shall shew in the second place that all Gentiles are under the Law, especially unbelieving Gentiles are under the very curse of the Law, to speak after the manner of men.

^{2.} That
Gentiles
are under
the Law
that are
unbelie-
ving.

1. Because they not believing cannot challenge the benefit of redemption by Christ, it being only to them that believe, *Gal. 3. Rom. 3.*

2. Because they are no where by God discharged there-of.

3. Because the Apostle doth still since Christ conclude all under sin by it, as before, *Rom. 3.* from the 9. to the 21. and indeed unless it were so, they could not be by any means convinced of sin, at least against God.

Ob. But it may be it will be still objected, that they have the law of nature; that is, the Law written in their heart.

Ans.

Ans. I answer as before, there is no Scripture speaks of any such thing, indeed I find the Apostle speaking of natures teaching, that if a man wear long hair it is a shame to him, &c. but this is no where said to be a Law written in their hearts, and I find further that the Apostle speaks of the work of the Law written in their heart, but judge as before I have shewn, that this cannot be the intendment of the Apostle, that they have the Law of God written in their hearts, and that for two reasons,

If it should be so meant, then it shews as before

that they have the seventh day Sabbath, it being one thing in the Law. The work of the Law is to condemn Gentiles do by nature, as being written in their hearts, according to what they judge good or bad.

1. Because that's the new Covenant priviledge, and promise, which if so, God should promise men nothing but what they had before, which were absurd, Rom. 8.

2. Because the Apostle saith that they have not the Law, but are a Law to themselves, i. e. they themselves are the Law to themselves, doing that which is right in their own eyes; onely they have the work of the Law written in their hearts, that is as I judge, their consciences bearing witness what is good or evil in their actions according to their judgements who are their own Law, and so have their thoughts accuse them if they or justify, do contrary to what they judge is right, and on the other side, if they do that which their Consciences say is right, their thoughts in the mean while excuse them; but if they be the law to themselves, they can but sin against their own Law, (unless they be under the censure also of the Law of God) and so sin against themselves onely, and not against God, if they sin not against his law, and then how should God be righteous in taking vengeance on them, and how shall he judge the world, do you think God will judge them by their Laws? as for instance they some of them judge it in themselves their duty to worship the Sun, Moon, and Stars, and images of their own making, and judge themselves worthy of punishment if they do any thing that may tend to the dis honour of their Idol, do you think that God will so judge them, or rather condemn them for worshipping them, as the Apostle did the *Athenians* for their idolatry, *Acts 17*, which is a breach of his law?

But so much for the second thing, that unbelieving Gentiles must be under the Law, or else how can God judge them that are not under his Law.

But thirdly that believing Gentiles, i.e. such as from among the Gentiles are turned unto God, are also under the Law, i.e. as ^{19.}
 a Rule of life as well as the Jew, and are still convinced of sin by it, although I judge that neither Jew nor Gentile that believe truly shall fall into eternal condemnation, but shall have redemption through the blood of Jesus: I say especially believing Gentiles, as these reasons will shew further.

1. Because they are brought under the sound and hearing of the Law, and therefore shall be judged by the Law, as must be the Apostles meaning, Rom. 2.12,13, as before.

2. Such are grafted in amongst the Jewes that fell not through unbelief, Rom. 11. 17, 24. into their Olive or Church, compare Isay 17. 6. Jer. 11. 16. Hosea 14. 6. and are made partakers of the fatnesse of the Olive, that is of their priviledges, and now this was one great priviledge, nay their chief priviledge, compare Rom. 3. 1. with Deut. 4. 6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13. and Psal. 147. for which they are there called to praise the Lord.

3. Believing Gentiles were once bound to keep it, that is, such as were joyned to the Lord, yea the very Sabbath in particular, Isay 56. 3. and it was his blessing and priviledge, verse 1,2,6,7, and there is neither Scripture nor yet reason why they should not still, or why it should be made void, they having as much need of rest as ever, and as much bound to serve and worship God as ever, as before also was shewn; and therefore unless it can be shewn to the contrary, it will remain both their duty and priviledge too; yet if any will undertake it let them search for Scriptures, and better reasons, or else is my judgement they will faille of it.

I do clearly judge that we are spared that work, which many would put us upon, vix. of proving a word of command particularly handed out to believing Gentiles since the resurrection of Christ; seeing that that Law was once given to the City of God, and we are made fellow-Citizens and of the household of God, and by that are bound to keep the Laws unrepealed; now if that either can be proved, or from any necessary consequence let it be produced and we will have done, i.e. where it is anywhere said, that either believing Jews or believing Gentiles are anywhere said not to be bound to keep the seventh day Sabbath, and let them not bring us to nature, for we have learned with

Ephes. 2.

the

the believing Gentiles to approve the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the Law, Rom. 2.18. but as for those things or Sabbaths that were a shadow of the body of Christ; which this was not, or any other things pertaining to the ten Tribes, or land of Canaan, or anything else that cannot of necessity pertain to us, we plead not for them, but for our blessed, or rather Gods blessed, holy resting time, wherein we may rest with our Father from all our labour, or else we know we cannot believe and enter into his rest, if we do not cease from our work, as God did from his own, which was on the seventh day, compare Heb.4. verse 10, with the 3.4.

4. Because they are bound to that Royal Law of love, both to their God and to their neighbour, which they cannot do if they do not fulfill the law, for love is the fulfilling of the law, love to our neighbours the fulfilling of the law to our neighbour, Rom.13. not as some weakly have imagined, that love to our neighbour is the fulfilling of the whole law of God, that is as touching God in a more particular consideration; no, Christ saith that the whole law hangs upon two such generals as the loving of the Lord with all our heart, &c, as well as our neighbour as our self, Math.22.40. and this is also the love of God that you keep his Commandments, and his Commandments are not grievous, 1 John 5.2.3. and now mark, to fulfill the law is at least to have respect vvhich David to all Gods Commandments, Psa'.119. 6. and to love them, therefore whilst any are pleading against any of the Commandments, they are pleading against love either to God or man, or to both, as methinks this fourth Command, as Mr. Brabourn well observeth, respecteth both the honour of God, Isay 58. 13. and the good of our neighbour; nay God cannot but be refreshed to see his people rest on it, if he was himself refreshed, because he himself rested on it, and grieved to see others work on it, especially his children, that should be followers of God as dear Children; but my dear friends grieve not the holy Spirit of God any longer, which dwells in Christ unmeasurably, and in us your poor despised Brethren in some measure.

5. Because Christ and the Apostles by faith have established it, see Rom.3.31. Math.5. yea every jot and tittle till heaven and earth passe, Luke 16. 17. and indeed it must be so, for if there be faith

faith in the blood of Christ for remission of sin, it must be such sins as are against the Law, so that the Gospel and faith have a relation to it, not a dependance upon the Law of God, that convinceth of sin, whereby all stand guilty before God, and therefore you may observe that the propitiatorie or mercy seat was set upon the Ark of the Covenant in which was the Law, Exod. 25.21. And when you shall see the Temple of the Tabernacle of the Testimony in Heaven opened, Rev. 15.3. Chap. 11.18, You will see the Ark of the Testament in Christs Temple, who shall take to himself his great power and reign, if once the veil be rent to you, and you come to enter into the holiest, there you find the Ark with the Law, comp. Rev. 8,9,10. and Heb. 9.19.20. And I have sometimes hoped that God is now opening his Temple for several reasons, as

1. Because of the Seventh Angels sound that hath been heard in the Land, Rev 11.15. Never such a noise of Christs Kingdom, since the Apostle Paul spake of it, 2 Thes.
2. And some Elders fallen already upon their faces worshipping God, giving thanks to the Lord for his goodness.
2. Because the Nations begin to be angry.
3. Because I see some of Gods wrath already broke forth against such as have not stooped to his Scripture, and advanced his Law, and especial that of his holy Sabbath; hath not this been the condemnation to the late King, Bishops, Parliaments, and Protectors, and Armies, that light hath come into the World and they have loved darkness rather than light? Witness Mr. Brabourn, Mr. Ockford, Mr. Tillam, and others, and shall there be a breach yet of Gods holy Law suffered by Rulers that he hath empowered to be a terror to evil doers? and shall they do evil themselves and suffer and encourage others therein, and will not God suffer a breach to be made upon them? Oh that it might be a warning to the present Rulers, and that it may sit with weight upon their hearts; let them consider that wch was written of old time, for their learning, Neh. 13.15. and especially it calls to the people of God that are stepping out of Babylon, alas wherefore are you put in Prison holes and

none saith diliver, and robbed of all your honours, and like to be of all your estates and liberties spoyled; Read that which God shewed to me as the cause of all, whilte I was fasting and praying to the God of Heaven for you, *Ifay.45.21.* to the end; Alas Brethren, for to you I now chiefly speake, do you think to despise the Law of the Lord and not keep his commandments, but will walke after lyes, that have caused you to err, after the which your Fathers have walked, *Amos.2.4,5* and not expect that the Lord will send a fire upon you that will devour the Palaces of your *Jerusalem*? will you be a rebellious people, lying children, Children that will not hear the law of the Lord; but say to these that God hath made seers, see not, and to the Prophets prophesie not to us right things, i.e. speake not to us of the commandments of God as they were given by *Moses*, which are right things, *Psal.110.128*. Prophetic to us smooth things prophetic deceits, desiring them all to go out of the way, and so to cause the holy One of *Israel* to cease from before them, and not expect a breach ready to fall? and that a dreadfull one; read and tremble, for it hath made my heart to tremble, especially in seeing in what an instant the breach is begun, the fire is begun in the Camp, the good Lord stay it; well what will you do? I think not to flee away from it upon Horses least God put you to flight indeed, and leave you as a beacon upon the top of a Mountain, and as an Ensign upon an Hill, will you know how to have the breach that is already made Sealed, take the Prophets direction, comparing the 25,26. verses of this chapter with the 58.chapter of *Ifay*. Read the whole, and miss not the 12,13,14. verses; friends there is desolation attends the whole Earth, but for what? see *Ifay 24. 5.* let all men fear and tremble, for except they repent, they will likewise perish, because I have not open to me any other way whereby I may witness for the Lord, I would lay hold on this. And that to let both the King and Bishops know (who are like again to share the rule of these Nations) or any else that shall be in power, that if they shall be found in the transgressions of their predecessors, they shal certainly not escape, although having cut off those that they thought were the great Instruments in

in the accomplishing of their former rebukes and desolations, so that they begun to cry peace, peace, yet then shall they see an hand stretched out that shall bring them down. Oh that the Rulers of this Nation would kiss the oⁿ least he be angry, *Psal. 2.* Oh that some or other would prevail with the King to read these Scriptures *Jer. 17.* from the 19. to the end, *Micab. 3.* and chapter 1.6.16. compare with 1. *Rev. 16.* 25, 26. and chapter 12.32, 33. *Ezek. 2c.* From the 10. to the 26. and let this be minded that that was one of *Jeroboams* sins to change Gods time of worship, as it is this day, having nothing to plead but the statutes of their Fathers which God would not have then walk in , and let the Bishops that cause them to err, see if the judgment threatened *Mal. 2.* to the 10. have not in part already justly come upon them , and will ere long be compleated except they repent; yea verily, and they shall not escape, *Isay. 9.13, 14, 15,* 16. But to conclude this, the judgments of God are abroad in the Land, Oh that the inhabitants thereof would learn righteousness, if you had but seen the terrible judgments of God upon some that have wrought upon the Seventh day (called Saturday) which is the Sabbath of the Lord, it would make you as it hath done me astonished, and I hope to fear and depart from evil, *Pro. 14.16.* but have not now an opportunity to mention them, because I would not further enlarge, onely in brief one at North *Walsham* in *Norfolk* whose bones were shaken out of joyn with terrible fits that sealed on her for it, as she confessed to me, for which she could get no remedy for many Monthes till she had confessed and forsaken her sin ; besides that horrible forsaking of the Lord, that she met with, till she had waited upon the Lord for healing in his appointment, *Jam. 5.14.15.* Wherein she met with present healing, which we desire may be mentioned to the praise of God.

I had thought to have given some reasons why I believe the seventh day Sabbath binding to Believers now , but being called on to be briefer hath prevented it , together with the consideration of this, that our main work is not so much to prove that which is so plain a command in Scripture unrepealed, as to maintain it against all Objections and Arguments

ments that the device of men invent to overthrow it; seeing (as hath already been proved) that it was a Law that once both Jew and Gentile was bound to: see farther *Esay* 56.6,7. For God spake not onely of the Jews resting on it, but of the stranger also, to whom there was to be one Law, as hath been shewn. If it should be said, That was such as were amongst them, and joyned to them; I answer, So are believing Gentiles, *Epb.* 2. *Rom.* 11. 17, 2. So that it seems to me of weight, that no Scripture is produced either for a change, or for a nullity of the seventh day Sabbath, nor yet any necessitous reason, but meer suggestions from unwarranted Principles; and indeed I cannot see how there may be safely a change made by man (which will be an adding to the words of the Law,) or otherwise a nulling of the Sabbath (which will be a taking away from the words of the Law) without bringing our selves under the curse; the good Lord make the way, and let every man seriously consider and weigh his persuasions, and the ground of them, to see whether (as the Apostle saith) they came of him that called you, *Gal.* 5. I shall therefore end all at present with a few Queries:

About the
first day
of the
week.

1. Whether that is to be accounted holy by Christians that never was sanctified by Christ either by word, Doctrine, or example?
2. Whether to blame them that work on it, whom the Lord never blamed, be not to be more righteous than our Maker?
3. Whether the first day of the week be not one of those six dayes that God himself hath said, that we that call the Lord our God may work on, and do all that we have to do?
4. Whether such as say we may not work thereon, do not give God the lye, whilst God saies we may?
5. Whether the like be not about working the seventh day; God saith we may not, and some say they may: God saith, Tis the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, if that God be thy God that brought the people of *Israel* out of the land of Egypt, and they say tis not; who now speaks true, if the word of the Lord abides for ever?
6. Whether or no the first dayes observation, without a word either of Institution or approbation from God, and making void the due observation of the seventh day according-

ing to the will of God, be not to make void a command of God through Tradition? And whether Christ reprobates not sharply such doing, *Matt.* 15?

7. Whether or no Christ's meeting with any upon a day, Saints meeting together to Preach or to break bread, or Saints giving Alms on the first day, can by any Scripture warrant prove it to be the Sabbath day? seeing Christ met with them on a fishing-day, *John* 21. Christ brake the bread to them on the first day at Even, and giving Alms is a continual every dayes duty.

8. Whether Christ, or any of his Apostles did keep holy the first day of the week, resting from common labour, spending the whole day in the service of God?

9. Whether or no the *Jews* of old were not bound to keep the fourth Commandment, and all contained in it, and whether, if the observation of the first day be in the fourth Commandment, the *Jews* were not bound to observe it as well as we, before Christ?

10. Whether if one day in seven were onely that which was commanded therein, *Moses* did not do the *Jews* wrong to tye them up to the observation of the seventh precisely? *Exod.* 24.

11. Whether or no all the Ten Commandments did not make up one law; and whether they that keep the whole of any law, and yet offend but in one point; be not guilty of all, *James* 2? *Com. 8.7.*

12. Whether that mind be not a carnal mind that is not subject to the law of God, nor yet can be; and whether the carnal minde is most at liberty, or that which loves God and keeps his Commandments? *Ch. 7.32.* *Psal. 119.*

13. Whether the *Jews* had most Priviledge that had the law of God committed to them, *Rom.* 2. Chap. 3. 11, 28, Chap. 9. 4. or the *Gentiles* that were without law; and whether if that were their priviledge, it would not be ours?

14. Whether believing *Gentiles* are not grafted in amongst the *Jews* that fell not through unbelief, and so are made partakers of their Priviledges, *Rom.* 11?

15. Whether Gods making known to them his holy Sabbath, was not one of their Priviledges, *Neh.* 9. 13, 1; *Ezek.* 20?

16. Whether or no it is not a reasonable thing that God should

should appoint both his worship, and his creatures, when they should rest and worship him, and when they should work, seeing he is their Lord; and what Master, or Lord, or Father would that men should work when they list, and rest when they list?

17. Whether or no they that either slight their Lords or Fathers order in this cause, do not grieve his Spirit?

18. Whether or no believing *Gentiles* are not (by being fellow-citizens with believing *Jews*) bound to observe their law, that is unrepealed, *Thes. 2*?

19. Whether or no believing *Jews* are not bound to keep the seventh day Sabbath yet, and so consequently believing *Gentiles*, they being fellow-citizens together; or whether there be any Scripture that saith they may work on it now, and not keep it; or that ever any might, either *Jew* or *Gentile*?

20. Whether or no all people are not bound to own the Scripture as Authoritative? And whether such as do, be not bound to observe what it commandeth being unrepealed? And whether it be lawful to say any thing is repealed, that cannot be proved?

21. Whether they that will not own the old Scriptures binding Authority, can challenge any of its promises as theirs?

22. Whether there be not a law that was before faith came, as the Apostle speaketh, *Gal. 3.* that was established by faith, *Rom. 3. 31.* and what that law is, if not that of the Ten Commandments?

23. Whether or no when a law hath a being before, it abides not firm, if it be not nulled by succeeding Rulers, and much more if it be established without a new institution?

24. Whether or no they that deny the seventh day for to be the Sabbath, because there is not an express word of command for it in the new Testament in terminis, and yet will allow themselves to make it void, or to change it without an express word for it, do not condemn themselves in the things they allow?

25. Whether to rest the seventh day from all our works, and to worship God therein, is (in it self) any more bondage than

than to do it on the first day, and whether (if any man were of Davids minde, that one day in Gods Courts were better than a thousand elsewhere, they would count it a bondage?

26. Whether men be altogether now without law, if we be under a law, whether the breach of that law be death, according to Rom 6. 23. if it be, what is the advantage to be delivered from one killing law, to be brought under another killing law?

27. Whether or no its lawful for a Magistrate by the law of God, to be such a terror to evil-doers still, as to put them to death in any cause, as for murder or the like; or are all such as have caused any to be so put to death, Murderers themselves for so doing?

28. Whether or no it be not as righteous a judgement of God, that men should be put to death that presumptuously break the Sabbath day, as he that doth so kill a man, seeing God hath said it in his word; and is not to say the contrary, to say that Gods judgements and wayes are not equal?

29. Why should it be a more unjust thing now, than afore-time?

30. Whether the being a Believer, doth acquit a man from the penalty of the law, if he should or could wilfully transgress it, or whether if he wilfully kill a man, he must not be put to death?

31. Whether that law that saith, He that sheddeth mans blood, by man shall his blood be shed, be not also Moses law, or the law given by Moses?

32. Whether when God did promise to write his law in the heart of his, he spake of the law that then was, or of a law that was not, a new law; and whether there be any Scripture for the writing a new law?

33. Whether that Promise can be meant of the law of faith, seeing tis to such as have that law already to whom the Promise is made, if it be made to any *Gentile*, for they can never challenge it, nor any other but by faith?

34. Whether when ever the Apostle speaks of justification before God, by the works of the law, doth he not intend the works of the Ceremonial law, or law of the Levitical Priest-hood?

35. Whether that was not the doctrine that was to be preached to Jew and Gentile, fear God and honour him, for the hour of his Judgments is come, Rev. 14.6,7. And whether the keeping of the Sabbath be not one ingredient to make his honour compleat, see I say 58.13?

36. Whether to deny the Sabbath day, be not to rob God of his holy day and Jesus Christ of one of his Royal titles, honours and Lordships, seeing he himself saith he is Lord of the Sabbath day, and so fall under that reproof Rom. 2.22?

37. Whether if the mercy of Israels redemption out of the house of Servants, was an argument of weight why they should be carefull to keep the Seventh day Sabbath, it being there Redemeers Sabbath; whether I say every believer whether he be Jew or Gentile being redeemed from a worse house of bondage by the Lord of that Sabbath day, be not much more bound to have respect to it , by the same reason?

38. Whether Christs declaring himself to be Lord of the Sabbath day be not his manifest owning of it to be his Sabbath day; and whether Christians be not bound to keep Christs Sabbath day?

39. Whether Christ could have any power to null it and make it void or change it, if it were not his ? and whether if he did not change it, or make it void but own it and keep it, and carefully at his departure advise his Disciples to pray that they might not be put to flight on it, I say whether it doth not remain his, and so ought to remain our Sabbath day ?

40. Whether to say that Christ Jesus either did change it or make it void and not to be able to prove it, be not to bear false witness against Christ?

41. Whether or no if that was an argument to prove the Seventh day to be the Sabbath to the Jews, because it was the Lord their Gods Sabbath in which he rested from all his work, and had therefore blessed it, and sanctified it, whether if the same Lord be our God , it proves it not to be as much our Sabbath?

42. Whether or no there be any time that God hath set apart

apart for rest to his creatures, or whether men may work creatures continually and not sin, and what that time is, and by what Scripture?

43. Whether God hath allowed man any time to worship him in, and what time is it, and by what Scripture? doth God require worship and allow no time for it?

44. Whether if a man may worship God when he will, if a man doth spend all his time in the worship of God, neglecting his ordinary calling, may he without sin believe God will provide for his household?

Whether when the Apostle saith he that will not work, let him not eat, and whether he walketh disorderly, and is to be withdrawn from that will not work every day? or on the contrary if he works one day in a Moneth, or a year is it enough? or hath God left no rule now for work, and for rest in respect of time whereby we should know when persons are idle and loyterers?

46. Whether if there were not any day set apart either by God, or mans Law, and that with a penalty too, in respect of some, but all were left to their liberty to walk, some or other would not, by making excuses when they should meet together to worship God.

47. Whether there be any Church this day in England that is of any magnitude that at any time did ever appoint a day to be set apart that had not some that made their excuse about their occasions, if they had been carefull to examine?

48. Whether if God had appointed no Solomne time for his worship, there would not be confusion in every Church, some at work, others at worship.

49. Whether Churches would not find it necessary to impose that upon one another, that they think a bondage to have imposed on them by God?

50. Whether or no not to be able to endure that which is commanded in the law, but to have it terrible to them by reason of Blackness and Darkness, and Tempest attending the delivering of it, be not Mount Sinahs dispensation; and whether such to whom it is so, are come to Mount Zion, to the spirits of just men made perfect?

51. Whether or no the law of Moses, or at least some of it, as the law of Moses binds not believing Gentiles, if they be such as are Israel, seeing it was given for all Israel on Mount Horeb to Moses: Or whether they be not Israel? *Mal. 4. 4.*

52. Whether such as fear the Name of the Lord, and expect the Sun of Righteousness to arise with healing under his wings, are not bound to keep the law of Moses? *Mal. 4. 2, 4.*

53. Whether it be so much our work to prove a new Institution, as maintain the old?

54. Whether such as scruple the seventh day being the Sabbath of the Lord, ought not to forbear working on it, when they cannot work in faith, seeing whatsoever is not of faith, is sin? *Rom. 14.*

57. Whether or no if the King and Bishops be now of the same minde with their Predecessors, viz: that every day is alike, from *Rom. 14.* they have any ground for punishing any for working on their Sunday and the Lords first day of the week, without contradicting their own Principle?

58. Whether if they own the 4th Commandement, they ought not (with good *Nebemiah*) to hinder that buying and selling that there is on the Sabbath, called (Heathenishly) Saturday; and whether if they do not so, God will not bring further evil on them, as he did on their Fathers, *Nebemiah 13.*?

59. Whether or no if they that read and hear of this, shall still go on in breaking the Sabbath, and the Lord perform his word upon them, that they dye for their indignities, I say whether I (having warned them) am not quit from their blood? *Ezek. 18.*

Postscript.

Reader, In faithfulness to the Lord, and to thy soul, have I displayed my Light that I have received from the Lord after three quarter of a years (night and day) waiting

waiting on the Lord by Prayer, and diligent searching of his holy Scriptures; such was the aversness of my wicked heart, that it was half a year before I could say my heart was willing it should be a truth; friends being against it, with profits, reputations, and pleasures, after the which my flesh lusted: But learn not to make provision for the flesh, to fulfil the lusts thereof; and remember that the noble and royal followers of the Lamb upon Mount Zion, that follow him whithersoever he goes, must be redeemed from the earth, and from amongst men; and marvel not although the wise and prudent have it hid from their eyes, yea that the most of *Israel* are not of this spirit. If thou wilt follow God fully with *Caleb* and *Joshua*, thou must be a man of another spirit; not onely from the *Egyptians*, but from the *Israelites* who fell in the Wilderness for breaking Gods Sabbath, Ezek. 20. Take heed that thou fallest not after the same example. Hearken to God, let him and his word be thy Teacher, and cease from man whose breath is in his nostrils, for man cannot save thee, nor justify thee, if the Lord condemn thee. Fear God, and keep his Commandments, for thats the whole duty of man; then shalt thou have praise of the same: and so ordering thy conversation aright, he will shew thee the salvation of God; which is the continual prayer of

Thy unknown Friend,

CHRISTOPHOR POOLEY.

An Hymne.

Sing Hallelujah to the Lord,
Let the Lords Remnant sing;
Let great Jehovah Nissi come,
And set up Christ our King.

Defend Ob Lord thy Witnesses,
With Courage and with Zeal,
Till thou most righteously dost judge,
And answer our app'el.

Come thou oh Jesus, quickly come,
For man thy Lawes make void ;
Thy servants Lord, thy servants L.
Are like to be destroyd.

Some are Imprisoned, some Re preach'd,
Some threatned to be slain ;
The persecution is begun,
None like thy Saints complain.

O Jesus, wipe our weeping eyes,
And answer our complaints ;
The sighs, the tears, the griefs, the cryes,
The Prayers of the Saints.

The Incense burnes, the Conseruacks,
At th' Altar of appeal ;
All call thee, quickly come away,
Our wounded hearts to heal.

If we must suffer for the truth,
Lord knit our hearts in one,
That we together al may cry
We will have Christ our King.

Then shall we see thine own Decree,
When Jesus Christ doth reign,
Zion shall sing unto her King,
And never more complain.

FINIS.

